

RESTORATION QUARTERLY

STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN SCHOLARSHIP

Vol. 1, No. 4

4th Quarter, 1957

EDITOR

J. W. Roberts, Abilene Christian College
Box 173, Station ACC; Abilene, Texas

EDITORIAL BOARD

Batsell Barrett Baxter, David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Tennessee
William M. Green, University of California, Berkeley 4, California
Reuel Lemmons, Editor *Firm Foundation*, Box 77, Austin, Texas
Joe Sanders, David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Tennessee
J. D. Thomas, Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas
Jack P. Lewis, Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas

BUSINESS MANAGER: Pat Harrell, P. O. Box 45,
Natick, Massachusetts

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY: Abe Malherbe, Box 144,
Lexington, Massachusetts

Contributions are invited. Manuscripts and communications for the *Quarterly* should be addressed to the editor. MSS should be type-written, double-spaced, and proof-read before submitted. Notes and appropriate references may either be at the end of the articles or at the bottom of pages. Hebrew and Greek words should be transliterated. A biographical sketch should accompany each new contributor's work. No manuscripts will be returned, except when accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

Books for review should be sent to *Restoration Quarterly*, P. O. Box 45, Natick, Massachusetts.

Subscriptions and business correspondence should be sent to the Business Manager, P. O. Box 45, Natick, Massachusetts.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Regular	Students
One Year \$3.00	One Year \$2.00
Single Copies \$1.00	

CONTENTS

A Note of Introduction—The Editor	146
The Use of <i>Bapto</i> in the Old Testament—John Scott	147
Notes on Religious Washings in the Graeco-Roman World— Abe Malherbe	152
Jewish Proselyte Baptism—Pat E. Harrell	159
Baptism and Faith—J. D. Thomas	166
Personalalia	171
The Spiritual Significance of Baptism—James D. Willeford	172
This Name Baptist—R. L. Roberts, Jr.	177
Baptismal Confession—Willian B. Decker	180
Baptism from the Second to the Fourth Century—Everett Ferguson	185
Baptism in the Medieval Church—Fausto Salvoni	198
Baptism in the Early Restoration Movement—Carl Spain	213
Some Modern Views on Infant Baptism—Frank Pack	220
Baptism for Remission of Sins—A Critique—J. W. Roberts	226

REVIEW OF BOOKS

Karl Barth: <i>The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism</i>	235
Oscar Cullmann: <i>Baptism in the New Testament</i> Abraham J. Malherbe	235
Jeremias: <i>Did The Primitive Church Practice Infant Baptism?</i> Dieter Alten	237
Index to Volume 1—Callie Faye Milliken	242

A Note of Introduction

By the Editor

What is baptism and what is its purpose? These questions are always with us, and they are becoming even more prominent with the resurgence of interest in the teaching of the Bible.

As long as the thinking of the leading theologians was dominated by the evolutionary presuppositions, they were not greatly interested in such questions as the action and purpose of baptism. The theology of modern American New Testament scholarship has not been concerned with continuity with the past. But some change for the better is taking place, and it thus becomes important to know what the Bible says and what the practice of former followers of Christ have believed and taught. Hence the discussing of questions about baptism, which has never ceased to be important to those who seek a restoration of the New Testament church, is apropos.

Baptism has held a central place in the teaching of the churches of Christ. The 18th and 19th century movement to restore the New Testament church held that it had recovered the true catholic position with reference to the ordinance. When this position was attacked by the faith "only" advocates, questions about baptism became a main point in public discussion, which has characterized the movement.

The Campbell-Rice debate, held at Lexington, Kentucky, in 1844, between Alexander Campbell and the Presbyterian, N. L. Rice, is typical. In that debate separate propositions were discussed on the action, subject, purpose, and administrator of baptism. The discussion is continuing and important.

This issue of the *Restoration Quarterly* should make a valuable contribution to the discussion of baptism. The editor wishes to thank those who contributed to the special issue. Much time and effort went into the preparation of the articles; and, inasmuch as the effort is a labor of love, this expression of thanks is the only reward of the laborers. The number is sent forth with the prayer that it will receive an earnest and sympathetic reading and that it will be to the glory of God.

The Use of *Bapto* in The Old Testament

John Scott

INTRODUCTION

There are different ways of improving one's knowledge on any given topic in the Bible. Sometimes one or more methods of study must be utilized before reaching a satisfactory conclusion. A lot depends on the subject and its ramifications.

The reading of one verse or paragraph may be sufficient because the immediate context summarizes all the Bible has to say on the subject. Other subjects require a study of many other passages which have to do with the same topic and each must be considered in the light of all the others ("marriage" for example).

Still another means is by an analytical study of certain pertinent words (as *psallo*—SING). This may take any number of different courses. To be thorough, one could begin with a dictionary definition of the English, then compare as many versions and commentaries as are available. If possible the word should then be studied in the original languages, Greek for the New Testament and Hebrew for the Old. The study may broaden out into translations made into various other languages; this shows how early scholars understood the word. To be even more detailed, if the material is available, a secular use of the word may throw light on the subject. A word study is always interesting if not profitable.

Now, many word studies have been made of "baptize" and I don't propose here either to redo them or summarize them. (For example see A. Campbell, *Christian Baptism*). While few, if any, scholars in modern times deny that "baptize" means immerse, there are a few students of the Bible who maintain that the Greek word *bapto* in the New Testament period was a general word meaning "pour," "sprinkle," or "dip." And this position is even supported by the ungrounded supposition that there was not enough water in the Jordan at that time to "baptize by immersion."

The purpose of this article is to show conclusively that even before New Testament times this Greek word *bapto* (or one of its derived forms), which has been transliterated in the New Testament by some form of "baptize," meant to "dip" or "immerse." This will be done by demonstrating that when the translators and scholars who translated the Old Testament into Greek came to a word which indicated "immerse," "dip," or "plunge" in the original Hebrew, they used some form of *bapto* for their rendering. Thus they show in the second and first centuries before Christ what Greek word best conveyed the concept of "immerse." Neither in the pre-Christian or Christian eras was there a word which better conveyed that idea. There was no other way they could have commanded "dipping for the remission of sins."

OLD TESTAMENT TEXTS

In the following references one will note first the English text with the pertinent word (or words) in small capitals. Below each verse that word in question will be repeated followed by the Hebrew word from which it is taken, together with its Greek translation.* Observations and conclusions will be considered toward the close of the article.

Ex. 12:22 "And ye shall take a bunch of hyssop, and DIP it in the blood that is in the basin; . . ."

DIP—(H.) *tabal*; (G.) *bapto*

Lev. 4:6 "And the priest shall DIP his finger in the blood, and SPRINKLE it seven times before the Lord, in front of the veil."

DIP—(H.) *tabal*; (G.) *bapto*. SPRINKLE—(H.) *nazah*; (G.) *raino*.

Lev. 9:9 "And the sons of Aaron presented the blood unto him; and he DIPPED his finger in the blood, and put it upon the horns of the altar, and POURED out the blood at the base of the altar."

DIPPED—(H.) *tabal*; (G.) *bapto*. POURED—(H.) *yatsaq*; (G.) *xeo*.

Lev. 14:6 "As for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar-wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall DIP them and the living bird that was killed over the running water."

DIP—(H.) *tabal*; (G.) *bapto*.

Lev. 14:15, 16 has an unusual set of circumstances. In these two verses both in Hebrew and Greek all three words are used for "sprinkle," "pour," and "dip," note:

"And the priest shall take of the log of oil, and POUR it into the palm of his own left hand. And the priest shall DIP his right finger in the oil that is in his left hand, and shall SPRINKLE of the oil with his finger seven times before the Lord."

POUR—(H.) *yatsaq*; (G.) *xeo*. DIP—(H.) *tabal*; (G.) *bapto*. SPRINKLE—(H.) *nazah*; (G.) *raino*.

Lev. 14:51 "And he shall take the cedar-wood, and the hyssop, and the scarlet, and the living bird, and DIP them in the blood of the slain bird, and in the running water, and SPRINKLE the house seven times."

DIP—(H.) *tabal*; (G.) *bapto*. SPRINKLE—(H.) *nazah*; (G.) *raino*.

Num. 19:18 "And a clean person shall take hyssop, and DIP it in the water, and SPRINKLE it upon the tent, and upon all the vessels, and upon the persons that were there, . . ."

*I have preferred to use the version published by the Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1917. In citing the Hebrew and Greek words I am using the root forms as they would be listed in a lexicon. This will be simpler and is all that is necessary. Statements about the derived formations, with one exception, are of such limited interest that I will not prolong the article with the burden of that detail.

DIP—(H.) *tabal*; (G.) *bapto*. SPRINKLE—(H.) *nazah*; (G.) *raino*.

Deut. 33:24 "And of Asher he said: Blessed be Asher above sons;
Let him be the favoured of his brethren,
And let him DIP his foot in oil."

DIP—(H.) *tabal*; (G.) *bapto*.

Josh. 3:15 "And when they that bore the ark were come unto the
Jordan, and the feet of the priests that bore the ark were DIPPED
in the brink of the water . . ."

DIPPED—(H.) *tabal*; (G.) *bapto*.

Ruth 2:14 "And Boaz said unto her at meal-time: Come hither, and
eat of the bread, and DIP thy morsel in the vinegar."

DIP—(H.) *tabal*; (G.) *bapto*.

I Sam. 14:27 "But Jonathan heard not when his father charged the
people with the oath; and he put forth the end of the rod that
was in his hand, and DIPPED it in the honeycomb, and put his
hand to his mouth; and his eyes brightened."

DIPPED—(H.) *tabal*; (G.) *bapto*.

II Ki. 5:14 "Then went he down, and DIPPED himself seven times in
the Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God; and his
flesh came back like unto the flesh of a little child, and he was
clean."

DIPPED—(H.) *tabal*; (G.) *bapto*.

II Ki. 8:15 "And it came to pass on the morrow, that he took the
coverlet and DIPPED it in water, and spread it on his face, so
that he died; and Hazael reigned in his stead."

DIPPED—(H.) *tabal*; (G.) *bapto*.

Job 9:31 "Yet wilt thou PLUNGE me in the ditch,
and mine own clothes shall abhor me."

PLUNGE—(H.) *tabal*; (G.) *bapto*.

There are two other places where some form of the root *bapto* appears. Each one has a different Hebrew word behind it. To be complete these should be listed.

Lev. 11:32 "And upon whatsoever any of them, when they are dead,
doth fall, it shall be unclean; whether it be any vessel of wood,
or raiment, or skin, or sack, whatsoever vessel it be, wherewith
any work is done; it must BE PUT INTO water, and it shall be un-
clean until the even; then shall it be clean."

BE PUT INTO—(H.) *yubah*, Hophal of *bo*, a word with a variety
of uses and meanings. Basically it is "come in, come, go in, go."
Its use here is in the causative passive form (Hophal) and
means "to be brought in," "be introduced into," "put in." This
is the reason our English versions so translate. But when the
translators of the Greek Septuagint came to this passage in He-
brew the word they picked to convey that idea was *baphasetai* (a
passive form whose ultimate root is *bapto*).

Psl. 68:23. This difficult verse gets us somewhat involved.
The King James Version translates as follows:

“ . . . that thy foot may be DIPPED in the blood.”

Revised Version: “. . . that thou mayest crush *them*, dipping thy foot in blood, . . .”

Jewish Publication Society Version: (v. 24) “. . . that thy foot may WADE through blood, . . .”

All of these translations are making an effort to make a smooth reading out of a difficult text. Note that R.V. uses “crush” and in addition supplies in italics “them, dipping.” This is an effort to keep close to the present Hebrew text.

R. S. V. uses “bathe” in place of these words but notes that this is based on the Greek, Syriac and Targum, while the Hebrew reads “shatter” (i.e. “crush”).

J. P. S. uses the ambiguous “wade” without notation, perhaps feeling that this alludes to both the Greek and Hebrew and might possibly express the result of the “crushing.”

A literal translation of the Hebrew text that has come down to us is: “. . . that thou mayest SHATTER thy feet in blood.” SHATTER—(H). *machats*, “to smite through, wound severely, shatter.” This phrase in this context just doesn’t make sensible reading to us.

But upon reading the Greek, we observe a different idea altogether, note: (In LXX it is numbered 67:24) “. . . that you may BATHE your foot in blood.” BATHE—(G.) *bapha*, root: *bapto*.

In Hebrew the word for “bathe” is *rachats*.

Thus, when we realize, 1) that the Hebrew text is not consistent with the blessings of the context, and 2) that the Greek, and Syriac translations, together with the Jewish Aramaic paraphrase, (all of which worked with a much earlier Hebrew text than we have to work with today) and, 3) that there is a Hebrew word for “bathe” which is exactly like the word in our text for “shatter” except for one letter, then we may rightly conclude as have the previous translators, that our received Hebrew text has had some change creep in with the passing of the years and that the Greek text shows a more reliable and trustworthy reading.

Therefore, the Hebrew word must have been *rachats*, which means “to wash” or “bathe.” At any rate the action intended seems to have been that of putting the feet in the blood of one’s enemies. To convey this idea of “wading in blood” the Greek translation uses what we would expect, *bapto*.

This is the only exception to the consistency of the other references. Even though it is figurative, the context shows the figure to be the kind of bathing which is in the liquid. That is why J. P. S. uses “wade.”

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

One, no one questions the meaning of the Hebrew word *tabal*. It is just as definite as is the English word “immerse.” Both the lexicons and usage demonstrate this without exception.

Two, the scholars who translated the Hebrew Old Testament into Greek sometime during the second and first centuries before Christ were consistent in their translation of this word with some form of the Greek word *bapto*. This shows the kind of action they understood from the Hebrew and the word they chose to convey that same action to their Greek speaking and reading brethren.

Three, you observe that there are other words in both Hebrew and Greek for the idea of "sprinkle" and "pour." There is a consistent line of demarcation between these and the words for "immerse" in these languages just as there is in English.

Four, the thoughtful reader will observe that without fail these references use "pour" and "sprinkle" in an active sense. That is, that it is the oil or blood or water that is poured or sprinkled. That which is engaging in the action described by the verb is the liquid itself. Whereas the subject of the action of "immerse" has the action performed upon it. It is the hyssop, or the finger, or the foot, or the spear which has the action performed upon it of dipping into the liquid. If the word *bapto* was as ambiguous as some would have us believe, we would have no way of knowing what the ritual was that the priests were to perform. They wouldn't know either. If a priest were told to "baptize" hyssop, he wouldn't know whether to chop it up in the "carrot dicer" and sprinkle it on top of the blood or whether to dip it like a paint brush in the blood.

Similarly, you will observe that the verbs for "pour" and "sprinkle" are always used with a LIQUID. The only way you can "sprinkle" is to have chopped up bits of something or else use a liquid (unless, of course, you change the subject and type of sentence you are constructing). But you notice in all the references that it is something solid that is dipped. It is in an active sense. The subject is dipped into something.

We may conclude by saying that the use of the word *bapto* in any of its forms as a word for dip, or immerse, is not confined to modern Greek language or religious usage, but goes far back in the pre-Christian times.

Notes on Religious Washings in the Graeco-Roman World

Abe Malherbe

The early Christian preachers proclaimed their message in a world in which washings were performed as part of the religious life. These notes do not claim to be an exhaustive treatment of sacral washings in the Graeco-Roman world, but merely seek to illustrate the fact that the religious environment of the Roman and Greek pagan was such as not to render Christian baptism incongruous to him. This paper, then, finds its place in the present collection on baptism because it contributes to an understanding of the religious background of the New Testament world. It will be the purpose of this study to take note of the general sacral washings in Greek and Roman antiquity, baptisms in general, and the baptisms which constituted part of the initiation rites into the Mystery religions. Finally, the differences between these rites and Christian baptism will be discussed, and the uniqueness of the Christian practice will be pointed out.

There is a primitive concept that a high degree of uncleanness exists at certain periods in human life due to the work of demons. At such occasions as birth, menstruation, illness, death, these demons flutter around like homeless souls, and the person who has them around does not only endanger himself, but also his whole surroundings. Washing as a religious observance is necessary for their removal. No evidence of washings has thus far been found in the Cretan-Mycenaean culture. It would seem that the Greeks brought the practice with them from Asia, since purifications are quite common with them. Hesiod (*Op.* 753 ff.) mentions that a menstruating woman has to purify herself. Before a wedding both the betrothed bathe in water that is brought from a sacred source. After birth, both the mother and child are unclean, as well as all those who touched the woman. A miscarriage causes a special degree of uncleanness, since it involves death. In the case of illness, bathings remove the demons. Asclepius often orders sacral washings which are healing, and which still the pain (*Sylloge*¹ 1170, 8, 22). Insanity especially is looked upon as the working of enemy powers which necessitate purification (*Soph. Aj.* 654 ff.). Death itself is unclean, and makes everything unclean with which it comes in contact (*Ditt. Syll.* 1218, 30). Purification is above all needed by murderers, and by those who cause blood guilt (*Antiphon Orator V*, 82).²

Purity is indispensable for those who wish to participate in the cult (*Lucianus, Syr. Dea* 53; *Ditt. Syll.* 1042, 2f.). One bathes be-

¹Dittenberger, W., *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, (Leipzig, 1898), second edition.

²Oepke, Albrecht, "Louo," *Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel, IV, pp. 299-300.

fore prayer (Hom. *Od.* IV, 750), or at least washes his hands (*ibid.*, II, 261). He who goes to the deity is called *lousamenos*, "he who is washed" (Ditt. *Syll.* 1159, 6). There were special washings for the priest, as in the case of the priest of Athena Kraneia in Elataia (Paus. X, 34, 8). Since, to the primitive mentality, going from a holy area to a profane one is dangerous, after worshiping Zeus or Asclepius the worshiper washes himself before going into the city (Porph. *Abst.* II, 44; Paus. V, 13, 3).

These few examples appear to be similar to the Old Testament washings. Early Christian apologists recognized this similarity, and charged the pagans with plagiarism from Moses (*cf.* Justin, *Apol.* I, 62, 1). Hellenism, however, does not have an understanding of a washing that is non-magical, yet obligatory and revolutionary in its breaking into human life.

Baptizein, "to baptize," as a general religious practice is found comparatively seldom in the Graeco-Roman world. There are five occurrences that are most frequently discussed. Four of them fall in the period after Christ, and do not add anything to our understanding of the religious milieu.³ The fifth⁴ is more relevant, since it is dated in the second century B.C., and since *baptizesthai*, "to be baptized," is connected with *sozesthai*, "to be saved," and *apothneskein*, "to die." This language brings to mind Paul's figure of baptism as a death (Rom. 6), and on the surface would be grist for Reitzenstein's mill in his attempt to prove that Christianity was influenced by paganism.⁵ Oepke points out, however, that Reitzenstein himself partly conceded that in this case there was no direct influence.⁶

It is the baptisms of the Hellenistic Mystery religions that are of most interest to the student of Christian backgrounds. These religions became popular after Alexander the Great, who was largely responsible for the dissolution of the Greek city-state. The Greek city as a religious community had met the need of the individual. When the Greek became a world-citizen he had to find his religious security in some other manner. The Hellenistic world had a sense of failure in sober calculation and in human effort, and the individual was thrown "back upon his own soul, upon the pursuit of personal holiness, upon emotions, mysteries and revelations."⁷ The Mysteries met his needs, for at their basis they had the ideas of "death and resurrection, regeneration and sonship of God, enlightenment and redemption, deification and immortality."⁸ Baptism was among the

³*PLond.* 121, 441, (III cent. A.D.); Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* III, 12, 82, borrowing from a pagan; Plut. *Superst.* 3 (II, 166a); *Corp. Herm.* IV, 4.

⁴*PPar.* 47 (W. Brunet de Presle).

⁵Reitzenstein, R., *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, p. 206f.

⁶Oepke, A., "*Bapto*," *ThWZNT*, IV, p. 530.

⁷Nilsson, M. P., *Greek Piety*, (Oxford, 1948), p. 189.

⁸*Ibid.*, p. 151.

initiation rites for those who wished and could afford to embrace their esoteric doctrines and practices.

Since the nineteenth century, the relationship of these religions with Christianity has been studied with great intensity. One group of scholars, among whom Hatch, Loisy, Bousset and Reitzenstein are the most well-known, have defended the idea that these religions exerted a great formulating influence on the doctrines and practices of the early church. Professor Metzger has shown that this view rests on a false methodology in dealing with the evidence at hand.⁹ Before proceeding to an investigation of baptism in the Mysteries, it will be of value to summarize his suggestions on how a study of the Mysteries should be conducted. One should first make a distinction between the faith and practice of the earliest Christians and those who lived later. The material about the Mysteries are for the most part late. Further, the nature and amount of evidence about the Mysteries should be carefully considered. Because of their very nature, little is known of their practices. In the same religion practices also differed with localities. It should also be kept in mind that the earliest Christians in the Palestinian church were Jews, who would abhor paganism. Palestine has been barren in yielding archaeological remains that would encourage the view that Christians were influenced by paganism. That there are parallels, has long been granted (Justin, *Apol.* I, 66, 4; *Dial.* 70:1; Tertullian, *De Corona* 15). Some of the alleged parallels are the result of the amalgamation of different elements drawn from various sources which result in a false composite view. When parallels are determined, it should be ascertained whether there is interdependence, or whether the parallels can be explained analogically. In those cases where the connections do seem to be genealogical, it should be determined whether the Mysteries influenced Christianity, or vice versa. The differences between Christianity and the Mysteries should also be kept in mind. The differences in regard to baptism will be discussed at greater length at the conclusion of this paper.

It should be emphasized that our information is gained from fragmentary statements by late writers who did not hesitate to give their own coloring to their material. Inscriptions do not help us much, since they deal mostly with the public and outward rites. The Christian Fathers, of course, give us considerable information, but the

⁹Metzger, Bruce, "Considerations of Methodology in the Study of Mystery Religions and Early Christianity," *Harvard Theological Review*, 48 (1955), pp. 1-20. The student who is interested in this aspect of the study will benefit from the extensive bibliographical information given in the footnotes of this article. The article also appears in outline form under the entry, "Mystery Religions," *Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (Grand Rapids, 1955).

question is always to be asked, how much did their prejudices influence their objectivity and veracity?¹⁰

A succession of initiatory rites led to acceptance into the Dionysian Mysteries. The initiate had to be continent for ten days (Livy XXXIX, 9, 4; 11, 2), after which he was led into the sanctuary. Before he was accepted into the Mystery, he was to partake of a meal, be baptized, and take an oath of secrecy. Livy (59 B.C.-A.D. 17), our main source, indicates that the purificatory rite was immersion, although a relief would lead us to believe that it was sprinkling. Leipoldt explains the relief as being a mythological account, and makes place for the sprinkling on the grounds of artistic freedom, since it would be difficult to represent immersion artistically.¹¹ In a mural in Pompeii, however, there is a representation that does not admit of immersion.¹² In the Dionysian Mysteries, therefore, the manner of the rite was not of utmost importance. The main feature was that water purifies.

The baptism of blood in the Mysteries of Attis goes back to antiquity. Cumont quotes Prudentius, *Peristephan*, X, 1006 ff, in describing this rite. The initiate sits in a trench underneath a perforated board. A steer, standing on this platform, is killed, and its blood drips on the mystic underneath. He moves his head and his body so that he is thoroughly covered with the blood, and catches some of it in his mouth. This rite does not signify only cleansing and the forgiveness of sins, but the blood of the animal actually imparts divine life. The mystic in the grave is participating in the drama of Attis. He is Attis in the grave; he dies with him in order to live with him. This divine life is given now. The initiate is honored as a god, Prudentius, *Peristephan* X, 1048.¹³ The resurrection is effective for eternity, though, as long as the baptism is repeated every twenty years.

Unfortunately, not too much is known about the initiation rites of Mithraism. There were seven classes of initiates, seven different feasts, and seven different sacraments. Baptism did play an important part, according to Tertullian (*De Baptismo* 5). The purpose of the baptism was to forgive sins (Tertullian, *De Praescr. Haer.* 40), yet it was more than this: The seven degrees of the initiation represented the seven planetary spheres through which the initiate has to pass before he reaches the home of the souls.¹⁴ It was thus a kind

¹⁰Gardner, P., "Mysteries (Greek, Phrygian, etc.)," *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. Jas. Hastings, IX, p. 77f.

¹¹Leipoldt, Joh., *Die Urchristliche Taufe in Lichte der Religionsgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1928), p. 41.

¹²*Ibid.*, p. 42 f.

¹³Cumont, Franz, *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* (New York, 1956), p. 66.

¹⁴Cumont, *Die Mysterien des Mithras* (1923), p. 140.

of rebirth.¹⁵ The taurobolium, or bath of blood is also to be found in Mithraism, and is perhaps earlier than that of Attis, although this is by no means certain.¹⁶ The earliest monument to Attis dates from the reign of Hadrian, in the second century of our era, which makes our information for these two Mysteries late.

The Eleusinian Mysteries were the most characteristic of the properly Greek Mysteries. They were celebrated in honor of Demeter and her daughter Persephone at Eleusis, near Athens. There was a succession of initiation rites lasting a number of days. Among these rites were the offering of a young pig, the covering of the initiate's head, and a water baptism. The baptism was a preparatory act which was performed in the sea two days before the real initiation took place. Its significance was that the initiate was adopted as a child of Demeter, and that he attained eternal life. Through this baptism regeneration and forgiveness of sins is received (Tert. *De Baptismo* 5). Baptism itself was not the act that admitted one into the Mystery, however. The real initiation took place within the precincts of Eleusis, to which only the initiates were admitted.¹⁷

The place that the Nile occupied in the life of Egypt is probably the reason for the importance attached to water in the religious life of the people of Egypt. The word for priest is derived from the root, "to purify through affusion." Especially in the religions of Re and Osiris did water play an important part. It was the custom to baptize children and also the dead.¹⁸ Our main interest for this study, however, is the Mystery of Isis, which had its origin in Egypt. Baptism is one of the rites that is performed in the re-enacting of the redemptive history. It was only a preparatory rite (Apuleius, *Metam.* vi, 11, 23). Rebirth proper followed a mystic death (*Met.* xi, 23). Baptism was repeated when some punishment was laid upon the initiate (Juvenal 6, 522 ff.), or as an ascetic practice (Tibull. I, 3, 23 ff.).

In comparing these practices with Christian baptism, the most striking difference is that pagan baptism is either just a preparatory rite among other initiation rites, or that it is sacramental in character. Baptism as a mere purificatory rite is foreign to the New Testament. Sacramentalism is a development in the Church later than the New Testament. For the mystagogue the rite is heavily sacramental; it brings about a new, divine life for the believer. The water itself is efficacious, with the result that the act can be performed for children, and even for the dead. It can also be repeated when its power has worn off. Romans 6 is often advanced as a passage that reflects a sacramental view that could easily have been accommodated from the Mysteries. It is in no way parallel to the

¹⁵Dieterich, A., *Eine Mithrasliturgie* (Leipzig, 1903), pp. 12-14.

¹⁶Cumont, *Die Mysterien des Mithras*, p. 169 ff.

¹⁷Gardner, *op. cit.*, p. 77 ff.

¹⁸Leipoldt, *op. cit.*, p. 45 f.

Mysteries, though. There is no deification here; there is no magical effect of the water; the act is performed only once; one does not enter a myth, but one lives in a historical drama which is moving irresistibly to its end; one enters into a new relationship with a Lord, but this does not presume a mysticism in the sense that man is greeted and honored as a God—Paul says that Christ lives in him, not that he is Christ. For the Christian all this takes place in the act; baptism is not a preparation for acceptance.¹⁹

The use of "the name" as a formula at baptism, as in I Cor. 6:11, ". . . you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and in the Spirit of our God," has been regarded as exorcistic and magical,²⁰ and as indicating pagan influence. This view is characteristic of the *religionsgeschichtliche* school which seeks to establish the interdependence between Christianity and its contemporary religions. These judgments are not based on demonstrated historical connections between the religions, but on certain motifs that are felt to be important. In the present instance there is no evidence to connect the Christian practice with the superstitious exorcisms of paganism. Clemen, who is himself sympathetic towards this approach, says of this assertion, however, that "in the ceremony of baptism, the pronouncing of the name of Jesus . . . has this significance only, that it indicates to whom the baptized person will thenceforward adhere. And so . . . the theory of a magical virtue in baptism cannot be proved."^{21 22}

The great emphasis on baptism as the expression of faith through which forgiveness of sins is obtained, is not part of the Mysteries. The tremendous seriousness with which guilt and atonement is preached in Acts is altogether lacking. The heathen belief in purifications had only a general influence, while the special form belongs exclusively to Christianity.²³

The supposed affinity between the Greek Mysteries and Christianity appears strange in the light of Paul's statement that the Greeks thought his message *moria*, foolishness. He certainly did not use

¹⁹"Taufe," Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopaedie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Series II, Vol. IV (1932), p. 2501-2517.

²⁰Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, p. 232 f.

²¹Clemen, Carl, *Primitive Christianity and its non-Jewish Sources* (Edinburgh, 1912), p. 237-8.

²²The study of "the name" as a formula is treated because of the attention it is currently receiving from scholars. The frequency and manner of its usage in the Qumran material, and also in the Egyptian Gnostic *Gospel of Truth* has caused this interest.

²³Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* (Leipzig, 1904), p. 180.

their language.²⁴ That he did not use the idea of rebirth in his discussion of baptism, which was a common view in paganism, is further evidence to Professor Nock that he was even unfamiliar with the Mysteries.²⁵

The differences in the performance of the practices indicate how tenuous the connections between them really are. In the one case the candidate is prepared for an imposing ritual that excites the emotions. In the other, men constrained by love for Christ, accept him as Lord as they render immediate obedience to him. Among the pagans the rite may be performed by sprinkling, affusion or immersion, while in the New Testament only immersion is found. The pagan performs his rite with water or blood, while the Christian practice calls for water. The simplicity of Christian baptism is in sharp contrast to its pagan counterpart, which is magical and grotesque.

Lexington, Massachusetts.

²⁴Nock, A. D., "The Vocabulary of the New Testament," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 52(1933), p. 134; cf. also Nock, "Hellenistic Mysteries and Christian Sacraments," *Mnemosune*, Fourth Series, V (1952), 177-213, esp. p. 200, "Any idea that what we call the Christian sacraments were in their origin indebted to pagan mysteries or even to the metaphorical concepts based upon them, shatters on the rock of linguistic evidence."

²⁵Nock, "Early Gentile Christianity and Its Hellenistic Background," in *Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation*, ed. by A. E. J. Rawlinson, (London, 1928), p. 114.

Jewish Proselyte Baptism

Pat E. Harrell

Christianity was not the first, nor is it the only religion to utilize water. Washings of one kind or another are almost a universal religious practice.¹ Questions concerning the origin of Christian baptism naturally arise. At one time scholars answered these questions by affirming the rite grew out of a Greek milieu; the mystery religions especially provided a fertile field for their speculation.² In recent times, however, there has been a reaction against such excessive claims in favor of a Jewish background for the Christian ceremony. Judaism, and not Hellenism, was after all the cradle of the Christian faith.

That water rites were common in Judaism can be amply illustrated from the Old Testament. These were primarily lustral washings to remove ritual defilement.

And if he who has the discharge spits on one who is clean, then he shall wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and be unclean until the evening. Lev. 15:8 RSV

But the religious use of water is not limited to such baths. Washings, or at least the figure of washing, in the prophetic books assume a deeper meaning with explicit moral implications.

Wash yourselves; make yourselves clean; remove the evil of your doings from before my eyes; cease to do evil, learn to do good; seek justice, correct oppression; defend the fatherless, plead for the widow. Isa. 1:16f RSV

At some time after the close of the Old Testament canon, for there is no biblical reference to it, a further development took place. The Jews began to baptize³ proselytes.

The genesis of this practice cannot be established with certainty. Many scholars once dated its beginning after the time of Jesus.⁴ The pendulum of opinion now seems to have swung back to a period be-

¹cf. J. A. McCulloch, "Baptism" (ethic) *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910) Vol. II.

²cf. Edwin Hatch, *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*. London, 1890. Percy Gardner, *The Growth of Christianity*. London, 1907. F. H. Case, *Experience with the Supernatural in Early Christianity*. New York, 1929. Alfred Loisy, *Les mysteres paiens et le Mystere chretien*. Paris, 1914.

³The same word, *tebilah*, is used both for "bath" and "baptism."

⁴In addition to those scholars advocating a Greek milieu for baptism cf. S. Zeitlin, "The Halaka in the Gospels," *Hebrew Union College Annual* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1924) Vol. I, pp. 357-363. *Idem*, "A Note on Baptism for Proselytes," *Journal of Biblical Literature* Vol. LII pp. 78f. T. M. Taylor, "The Beginnings of Jewish Proselyte Baptism," *New Testament Studies* Vol. II pp. 193-198.

fore the Common Era, although explicit literary proof is lacking.⁵ The reasons for this view have been variously expressed:

(1) While the *Mishnah*⁶ records rabbinical controversies about the administration of proselyte baptism, it is silent as to its origin. This silence suggests, in the light of the usual rabbinic custom of citing authorities, that the rite was never viewed as an innovation, but as a natural extension of the laws of ritual cleanness.

(2) Any dating of proselyte baptism cannot ignore the figure of John the Baptist. The ready reception given to the baptism proclaimed by this austere prophet indicates the practice was not entirely new to the Jewish scene.

(3) Placing the Jewish baptism after the origin of the church requires the adoption by Judaism of the Christian rite *par excellence* at a time when animosity existed between the two faiths.

(4) The threefold ceremony (circumcision, baptism, sacrifice)⁷ by which a Gentile became a proselyte is usually accepted as normative.⁸ This means that proselyte baptism was practiced before A.D. 70 when the temple was destroyed and sacrifice could no longer be incumbent upon the convert. In the absence of a specific reason for its beginning between the birth of the church and the destruction of the temple, it is probable the ceremony was in use before the rise of Christianity. These points are all somewhat in dispute still. See the close of footnote 8.

As to the mode of the rite, there can be no doubt.⁹ It was by total

⁵E. Schurer, *A History of the Jewish People*. Edinburgh, 1890, Vol. II Part II. W. Brandt, *Die jüdischen Baptismen*. Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1910. I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, 1917. J. Coppens, "Baptême," *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, 1928. G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, 1944. J. Jeremias, *Der Ursprung der Johannes-Taufe*, Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1929. H. H. Rowley, "Jewish Proselyte Baptism" *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 1940.

⁶The *Mishnah* is the collection of authoritative traditions explaining or supplementing the laws of the Pentateuch. Although it was not codified until the third century by Judah the Prince, it contains many traditions which antedate the Christian era. References are to the translation of Herbert Danby, *Mishnah*. Oxford: University Press, 1933 and will be designated by "m."

⁷*Mekilta* on Exodus 12:48. A commentary (*midrash*) on the legal portions of Exodus by the school of Rabbi Ishmael (2nd. Century). Translated by J. Lauterbach. Philadelphia, 1933.

⁸G. F. Moore, *Op cit*, p. 331f. W. Braude, *Jewish Proselyting* (Providence: Brown University, 1940) p. 74. B. Bramberger, *Proselytism in the Talmudic Period* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1939) p. 42 f. J. Bonsirven, *Le Judaïsme palestinien* (Paris: a l'Institut catholique de Paris, 1935) p. 29 f. For the opposite point of view on these matters see the article by T. M. Taylor, "The Beginnings of Jewish Proselyte Baptism" *New Testament Studies* Vol. 11 pp. 193-198.

⁹C. Rogers to the contrary, cf. "How Did the Jews Baptize?" *Journal of Theological Studies*. Vol. 12, 1911, p. 437-445.

immersion.¹⁰ To guarantee sufficient water for immersion the minimum capacity of the pool was regulated at forty *seahs* (ca. 60 gallons).¹¹ So essential was it for the water to touch the entire body, the baptism was performed in the nude. Nothing, not even a hair ribbon,¹² was allowed to break the contact with the water. The type of water was also regulated, with the preference being given to running or living water.¹³

The rite was self-administered in the sense that there was no one who assisted the candidate under the water. This does not mean, however, that the Gentile could perform the ceremony in solitude. Before a baptism was valid, according to the *Talmud*,¹⁴ the presence of three witnesses was required.¹⁵ It was their task to instruct the Gentile in Jewish doctrine as he stood in the water.¹⁶

After he has taken upon himself to accept Judaism, he is taken to the immersion-house. Having covered his nakedness with water, they instruct him in some of the details of the commands, with specific reference to the laws concerning the gleanings, the forgotten sheaf, the corner of the field, and the tithes.¹⁷

Care was taken that this instruction did not overly emphasize the difficulties of the faith, lest the candidate be discouraged.¹⁸ The baptismal service could not be performed at night,¹⁹ presumably because the three witnesses formed a court which was prohibited from meeting then, nor could it be performed on the Sabbath.²⁰

¹⁰I. Abrahams, "How Did the Jews Baptize?" *Journal of Theological Studies*. Vol. 12, 1911, pp. 609-612. J. Lauterbach "Mikwa'ot" *Jewish Encyclopaedia* Vol. 8 pp. 587f. W. Brandt, *Op Cit*, p. 46f.

¹¹cf. m. tractate *Mikwa'oth* pp. 732-745.

¹²*Ibid.* 9.1-4 p. 742f.

¹³*Ibid.* 1.1-8 p. 732 cf. a similar preference in the *Didache* VII.

¹⁴The *Talmud* is the literature in which the *Mishnah* is reproduced along with a commentary (*Gemara*) upon it. The *Talmud* produced in Babylon was compiled during the fifth century. References are to the translation edited by I. Epstein, *The Babylonian Talmud*. London: The Soncino Press, 1936, and will be designated by "t."

¹⁵t. *Yebamoth* 47b p. 314 Three witnesses instead of two seems to have been the common practice.

¹⁶*Ibid.* p. 311. Women proselytes sat in the water up to their neck while they were instructed by the witnesses who were out of sight. cf. *Gerim* 1.4.

¹⁷*Gerim* 1.1 p. 47. An "extra-canonical" tractate of the *Talmud* translated by Michael Higger, *Seven Minor Treatises* (New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1930) p. 47.

¹⁸t. *Yebamoth* 47b p. 313.

¹⁹*Ibid.* 46b p. 307

²⁰*Ibid.* p. 305

Concerning the purpose of proselyte baptism, there is no unanimity among scholars. The disagreement revolves around the sacramentalism of the rite. Did the Jews believe the ceremony conveyed some special grace? Those who answer negatively find the purpose primarily in ritual cleansing.²¹ They reason proselyte baptisms developed naturally from the ablutions required of the Jews. The candidate, not having observed the laws of ritual purity as a pagan, might be expected to perform the cleansing rite at his admission. Even this view probably contained a latent sacramental idea. The Jewish concept of the relationship between body and soul was such that what affected the body also affected the soul.²² The absence of explicit definitions regarding the results of the rite is attributed to the fact that the Rabbis were not given to systematic theological formulations.²³ Those who interpret the baptism in a sacramental sense do not affirm that the water *per se* conveys grace apart from the spiritual condition of the candidate. The pre-baptismal interrogation of the Gentile as to his motives for accepting Judaism is an indication of the necessity of both faith and reformation of life.²⁴ Those who accepted Judaism out of religious motives were called "righteous proselytes" in contrast to the spurious proselytes who acted out of other motives.

Proselyte baptism should be interpreted as having both a negative and a positive aspect.²⁵ Negatively, it removed the noahide sins²⁶ of the candidate. R. Judah affirmed that a convert was not held accountable for his pre-baptismal sins.²⁷ Positively, it was a "new birth"²⁸ by which the old life was left behind and a new life inau-

²¹cf. A. Plummer, "Baptism" *Hastings Dictionary of the Bible* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902) Vol. I. G. W. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1951).

²²J. Pedersen, *Israel* (Cambridge: Oxford University Press, 1954) Vol. I-II p. 339. W. F. Flemington, *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism* (London: S.P.C.K., 1948) p. 11

²³F. Gavin, *The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments* (London: S.P.C.K., 1928) p. 5

²⁴t *Yebamoth* 47a p. 310f

²⁵I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, Op Cit*, p. 42. J. Bonsirven, *Op Cit*, p. 30. J. Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1953) p. 247. K. Kohler, "Baptism" *Jewish Encyclopaedia* Vol. I p. 500. H. Strack und P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (München: 1922) Vol. I p. 928ff

²⁶Noahide laws were those moral requirements of the whole human race against idolatry, adultery and incest, bloodshed, blasphemy, robbery, social injustice, and eating flesh cut from a living animal.

²⁷*Gerim* 2.5 p. 50

²⁸t *Yebamoth* 48b p. 320

gured.²⁹ When the candidate emerged from the water he was "an Israelite in all respects."³⁰ This latter statement suggests what was perhaps the motif of the baptism. As the Jews were saved through their baptism in the Red Sea,³¹ so proselytes were made to share this experience by a water baptism that placed them on an equal footing.³²

Proper candidates for the ceremony included not only adults, but their children as well.³³ This fact has received considerable attention by apologists for Christian infant baptism.³⁴ The Jewish practice was primarily initiatory in character and had no relationship to any concept of inherited sin.³⁵ Because of the intimate family relations, it was expedient that the entire family be Jewish. Children born subsequent to the conversion of their parents were not baptized for they were deemed to be Jews by generation. Even a child that was in embryo at the time of his mother's conversion did not need baptism.³⁶ That infant baptism was largely an accommodation to rabbinical casuistry is seen in the fact infant proselytes were afforded a special privilege. Upon reaching the age of accountability they could repudiate Judaism and not be counted as apostates.³⁷

Although baptism was only one of the threefold requirements for conversion,³⁸ there were certain factors at work that tended to emphasize its importance. One of the requirements, sacrifice, ceased when the temple was destroyed.³⁹ The requirement of circumcision

²⁹*Ibid.* 22a p. 131

³⁰*Ibid.* 47b p. 314

³¹cf. 1 Corinthians 10

³²J. Jeremias, *Op Cit.* p. 312-320. Otto Piper, "Unchanging Promise, Exodus in the New Testament" *Interpretation* Vol. XI 1957, p. 3-22. D. M. Stanley, S. J. "The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism" *Theological Studies* Vol. 18 1957, p. 186f. P. Lundberg, *La Typologie baptismale dans l'ancienne Eglise* (Uppsala, 1942) pp. 116-145.

³³t *Kethuboth* 11a p. 55. The date of the origin of infant proselyte baptism is, of course, not known.

³⁴Oscar Cullmann, *Baptism in the New Testament* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1950) p. 62f

³⁵t *Kethuboth* 11a p. 55

³⁶t *Yebamoth* 78a p. 526f

³⁷t *Kethuboth* 11a p. 55. There is the implication in the *Palestinian Talmud* (Kid. 4.1.65b) that if the child was too small to understand what happened at his baptism, the act would have to be later repeated. This does not appear, however, to be normative.

³⁸cf. *Gerim* 2.4 p. 50

³⁹*Ibid.* For a time the proselytes set aside funds for the sacrifice when the temple would be rebuilt. This practice was stopped lest these funds be misused. cf. t *Shehalim* 3.22 p. 179.

had certain limitations. In the first place, the majority of proselytes were probably women.⁴⁰ And of the men converts, many had already been circumcised.⁴¹ Only the rite of baptism was applicable to every proselyte. In the eyes of the gentiles it was the ceremony *par excellence* by which one accepted Judaism.

Whenever we see a man wavering, we are accustomed to say: 'He is not a Jew but pretends to be one.' But when he accepts the experience of the baptized and chosen, then he is in name and reality a Jew.⁴²

Within Judaism itself it came to be viewed as the determining act at which point a man ceased to be a heathen and became a Jew.⁴³

For R. Zera said in the name of R. Johanan: One does not become a proselyte until he has been circumcised and has performed ablution, and so long as he has not performed ablution he is a gentile.⁴⁴

It is probably in this sense that the school of Hillel could argue that one who was baptized but not yet circumcised was a full convert.

If he performed the prescribed ablution but had not been circumcised, R. Joshua said, 'Behold he is a proper proselyte; for so we find that the mothers had performed ritual ablution but had not been circumcised.'⁴⁵

The ceremony of baptism could scarcely have been an innovation to the people of "Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region about Jordan" when John appeared in the wilderness proclaiming it. In addition to proselyte baptism, immersions were of special significance in the Essene sects, as exemplified in the Qumran community.⁴⁶ It is not the purpose of this paper to attempt to find a prototype of John's baptism in proselyte baptism, nor to attempt to trace any direct influence. They were different in several respects. One is indicated by the very name given to John, the Baptizer. His baptism, unlike the proselyte rite, was apparently administered either by John or his disciples. John's baptism was for those who were already the seed of Abraham. For him God's criterion was no longer generation, but regeneration.⁴⁷ And John's baptism was an eschato-

⁴⁰F. M. Derwacter, *Preparing the Way for Paul* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1930) p. 107

⁴¹In such cases the school of Shammai required the shedding of a drop of the candidate's blood as the seal of the covenant. The school of Hillel did not. cf. *Gerim* 2.2 p. 50

⁴²Flavius Arrianus, *Epictetus* (Camarthen: J. Evans, 1882) II.9

⁴³Strack-Billerbeck, *On Cit*, Vol. I p. 104f

⁴⁴t *Berakoth* 47b p. 288

⁴⁵t *Yebamoth* 46a p. 303

⁴⁶John A. T. Robinson, "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Community," *Harvard Theological Review* Vol. L (1957) pp. 175-191 suggests the hypothesis that John's baptism was closely related to the lustrations of the community at Qumran rather than proselyte baptism.

⁴⁷C. H. Kraeling, *John the Baptist* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951) p. 102f

logical rite. "It was the initiation ceremony, not only to a new life, but also to a new age."⁴⁸ Whatever can be said of the similarities, and all baptisms by the very nature of the case are similar, it must be remembered above all that John's baptism was unique because he was unique. His ministry was based upon the fulfillment of Isaiah 40:3. This is the verse by which he is introduced in every gospel.

The voice of one crying in the wilderness:
Prepare the way of the Lord,
make his paths straight. (Matt. 3:3 RSV)

Under this divine commission he announced his baptism.⁴⁹ His baptism then was unique in (a) the authority behind it, (b) its relation to the coming Messiah, (c) its relation to the coming Kingdom. The baptismal rites that antedate John should be understood as a part of the preparation for "the way of the Lord."⁵⁰

⁴⁸H. H. Rowley, *Op Cit*, p. 333

⁴⁹cf. Jesus' question about John's baptism—was it from heaven? Mat. 21:25 etc.

⁵⁰With reference to the arguments made for infant Christian baptism drawn from infant proselyte baptism, it should be noted that the date of the origin of infant baptism is not known. This writer feels that the place to attack Cullmann is not about the date, but about the purpose of infant proselyte baptism and the purpose of the supposed infant Christian baptism. Infant proselyte baptism involved matters of inheritance, of marriage, and other legal aspects. These never existed in Christianity and consequently there would be no need for infant Christian baptism. Before anyone can use the Jewish practice as a parallel for a supposed Christian practice he must also explain the special privilege proselytes converted while still infants had in repudiating Judaism at a later time.

Baptism and Faith

J. D. Thomas

Baptism is unquestionably a "work" in the sense that it is an outward or overt action. How baptism relates to faith is indeed an important question in the study of the Christian religion. The right relationship between "faith and works" has always been a problem. It was even in Paul's day.

Christianity is, without question, a religion that advocates justification on the ground or basis of *faith*. "For by grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, that no man should glory." (Ephesians 2:8,9)

Romans 1:17 states the theme of the book of Romans, indeed the theme of Christianity,—“the righteous shall live by his faith.” In establishing this doctrine Paul says in Romans 3:28—“We reckon therefore, that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law.” Romans 9:30-32 notes—“The Gentiles, who followed not after righteousness, attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith: but Israel, following after a law of righteousness, did not arrive at that law. Wherefore? Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by works.”

Paul is even more definite in Philippians 3:8,9, where he was willing to give up his *achievement* under the legal (works of merit) program of the law of Moses—“I count all things to be loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but refuse, that I may gain Christ, and be found in him not having a *righteousness of mine own*, (italics mine J.D.T.) even that which is of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is from God by faith.”

Also definitely to our point is Galatians 2:16—“Yet knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but through faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law: because by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified”; and Galatians 3:24—“So that the law is become our tutor to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.”

The tenor of the above scriptures is that man does not *achieve* his own salvation. It is a *gift* of God, conditioned, to be sure, but grounded upon his faith, and not upon the earning power of his own meritorious work or his own achievements. Our salvation is grounded upon the merit of Christ; or if you please, upon *His* achievement, upon what He did for us, and not based or grounded in principle, on works which we do ourselves. The righteousness is given us, for in Christ we have not “our own” righteousness, but rather that which becomes ours through faith. This means that human works, or works of human merit or human achievement, or what one could

call "mere rule keeping," are not adequate to save.

Paul says that no man is justified by the law, and he says in Galatians 3:21—"If there had been a law given which could make alive, verily righteousness would have been of the law." All this means that it takes more than a "mere legal program" or set of rules, which man himself could keep, to make human salvation possible. In the first place no man can keep rules perfectly, and there is nothing about a law or a rule that can take away guilt, once the law has been violated. Humanity's greatest need, therefore, is forgiveness from sin, and no amount of human achievement is capable of the removal of sin once it has been committed; so *legalism* cannot be a means of justification. There must be an arrangement for grace, whereby man can have forgiveness which is not granted upon his own merit or achievement.

The law of Moses was a good law, as a law, we are told in Romans 7:12; but no merely legal program can provide salvation. That is why Jesus had to come and die and provide the true "righteousness," which then can be "reckoned" to us on the basis or ground of our faith.

BAPTISM AT WORK

We observed to begin that baptism is a work; but just above we have insisted, with the Bible, that salvation is not conditioned upon "the works of human merit," and this whole doctrine, which is Christianity in summary, is found in Romans 4:5—"But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is reckoned for righteousness." However, we find an apparently contradictory teaching in James 2:14-26. James is also explaining the Christian system of justification, and he insists that works are necessary—(v. 17) "Even so faith, if it have not works, is dead in itself"; (v. 20, 21) "Wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith apart from works is barren? Was not Abraham our father justified by works?"; (v. 24) "Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not only by faith"; and (v. 26) "Even so faith apart from works is dead."

The apparent tension here between Paul and James has been one of the thorniest problems in the history of Biblical interpretation, and the whole problem of the right relation between faith and works is dependent upon a proper interpretation of these passages. Indeed, both Paul in Romans 4 and James in 2:23 quote from Genesis 15:6, for what might appear to be opposite conclusions.

To resolve this apparent dilemma, we need to understand that there are two kinds of works under consideration in these passages: (1) "works of human merit" and (2) "obedience of faith." The works in each case are differently motivated. In the first instance, "works of merit" are works that are done purely for the pay or reward involved and for no other concern. "Obedience of faith," however, is work that is done because one has faith and is trusting in the Lord for the fulfillment of his promise and in Jesus Christ for the re-

demption that is available through the merit of his shed blood. In the first instance one works purely to earn or achieve his reward; whereas in the second, one works because of love, gratitude, and because of his relation to Christ and to the family of God; and as an expression of his trust in the saving power of Christ's blood.

Let us illustrate the two kinds of works in the person of a Registered Nurse, who faithfully discharges her duties in behalf of a critically ill child, but for which she expects her salary check from the parents at the end of the week according to a contract—"so much work, so much pay." Later on, however, this nurse becomes a mother, and her own child develops the illness and requires the same attention. Now, however, the work is motivated because of the love and the relationship between her and the child, and it is not a question of the work's being done for pay; rather she sits at the bedside of her own sick child without watching the clock. In this case it is not a work of merit, where the work is to be "exchanged for the reward"; but it is a work of love, with no thought of any monetary consideration, simply because the need exists and the relationship demands it. But the motivation in this case is even stronger than if it were done for pay. A *real* mother's love requires that the mother nurse her own child; and as James points out, *real faith* in Jesus Christ demands work on the part of Christians. However, the Christian doesn't work because his work is meritorious; but, because there is the need, he has the ability, and his faith and relationship to Christ and his love for the family of God demand it. In this case he really has a stronger motivation than if he were simply working to exchange the work for "a few extra days in heaven."

When Paul says that we are *not saved by works*, he means "works of human merit." Man cannot achieve or earn his salvation. It is definitely based on our faith (trust or reliance). James, in insisting that faith must be accompanied by works, is *not* talking about works of merit, but about "obedience of faith," and, in the same sense that a mother who wouldn't nurse her child obviously would have no love for it, he says that a faith which will not work is dead and will not bring salvation. So there is no real tension between Paul and James after all. They both teach "justification by faith," but James merely points out that the faith must be of a certain kind. He is not saying that the works that one must do, have legal merit! Obedience of faith is not contrary to faith, but indeed is a part of it, and as James says in 2:22—"By works was faith made perfect" (complete).

Actually, to understand that Paul is speaking of "works of merit" as a justifying principle, such as the law of Moses or any other legal program presents; and that James speaks of the *nature of the faith* that saves, is the only way that the New Testament can be understood. Because men in general have failed to see these points, we have much denominational error and confusion at this point.

Martin Luther failed to see how these scriptures could be harmonized, and he was led to consider James as "inferior scripture,"

because he thought James was talking about the same kind of works that Paul was, and in which case there would be a definite contradiction of scripture. Even Luther himself vacillated in his conception of the relationship of baptism and faith, for although he is the "father" of the doctrine of "justification by faith only," he can be quoted as understanding that baptism is "obedience of faith." For example, in his commentary on Paul's epistle to the Galatians (Blair, Nebraska: Lutherans in All Lands Co.,) p. 147:

Thus are they . . . calling back the people from baptism, faith, . . . to law and works, turning grace into law and law into grace.

Because denominational people are so prone to think of baptism as a work of human merit, they have fought it as a condition of salvation with all the power that they have. If they could see that baptism is simply an expression of faith or obedience of faith, and not contrary to it, and not the kind of "works" which Paul condemned, they also would be able and willing to teach it as essential to salvation. Indeed, in their present attitude they have to think of Paul as contradicting himself, because he does teach the necessity of baptism in a definite, clear way in many places.

Men are justified, then, on the ground or basis of faith. But the faith includes obedience, just the same as it does trust, reliance, repentance, love, gratitude, etc. Baptism is "faith expressed," or obedience of faith; and as James points out, without it the faith is dead."

ABRAHAM'S FAITH

Romans 4 presents Abraham's faith as a type of ours. It indicates, of course, that he was justified by faith, not works, and *before* he was circumcised. Some interpreters take this to mean that his justification was realized *at the instant* of faith, or when he had a proper attitude, and before he expressed his faith in any manner whatever. It is my impression that God always withholds any blessings that are conditioned upon faith until that faith has been expressed. This may be illustrated in the case of the healing of the blind man of John 9; of the two blind men of Matthew 9; even of the man sick of palsy of Mark 2; and in any number of other instances. The New Testament teaching concerning the design of baptism overwhelmingly supports this point, namely that forgiveness of sins is not realized until the faith is "completed" by being expressed in some action. It is the dead, old man of sin who is buried in baptism; and it is the new creature in Christ, the newborn babe, who is resurrected from "the grave" of the immersion, so forgiveness comes at the "completion" of the faith, not before.

Some interpreters say that the faith is not a "dead" faith before it works, otherwise it would not lead to the obedience; and they say that a dead faith is *permanently* dead, and can never lead to obedience. Although faith may be "alive" before obedience, in some "embryonic" sense, a later refusal to obey would cause it to cease

from being a living faith and would surely make of it a dead faith. On the contrary, a *repentance* after such refusal, as is illustrated in Matthew 21:28 ff., causes the individual to decide to obey, and the change of attitude or mind here, leading to the obedience, eventuates in the once "dead" faith now becoming again a living active faith. It is wrong, therefore, to say that any faith is *permanently* dead, or that it could never lead to action.

James says the "non-working faith" is a dead faith and that the works that one does as obedience of faith make the faith to be a living and indeed a saving faith. The word "perfect" in James 2 means "complete," but an incomplete faith is not a saving faith, even if it could by any means be called a "living" faith, as a careful study of the chapter will show. Dead faith is a faith without obedience, regardless of the reason for this lack of obedience, according to James. Therefore, it would appear that there is no such thing as faith's bringing God's blessings, in the absence of the faith's being expressed, or "without works."

Abraham's faith is referred to as an illustration of justification without any work whatever; and the chief proof-text given is Genesis 15:6. James quotes this passage relative to Abraham's offering of Isaac, but Paul's reference to it in Romans 4:3 refers to Abraham's justification at an earlier date, before he was circumcised at the age of 99 (Genesis 17). The *assumption* made by this interpretation is that Abraham's justification before his circumcision did not require any "expression of faith" whatever. This assumption is unjustified since Romans 4:19-22 indicates that when Abraham went in unto Sarai in the attempt to have a child and in order to make God's promise come to fulfillment, that he was "expressing his faith." Therefore, such an *action* in this case is "faith expressed." Indeed, when Abraham went unto Hagar at the age of 86 (Genesis 16) in the effort to help God's promise of making him "a great nation" and "a blessing for all families of the earth" through his seed, he was expressing his faith in God and God's promise.

Thus the assumption that Abraham did not "express his faith" in any overt action before the time of his circumcision is unjustified. There were, no doubt, many ways in which his faith was expressed relative to God's promises. Indeed, his "going out (from Haran) into a land (Canaan) that God would show him" was a great expression of his faith in an outward action in connection with the original promise of Genesis 12. We should realize, therefore, that we have no right to say that Abraham or anyone else has ever received God's blessings on the condition of faith, before and without obedience of faith or without an expression of faith in some way.

Surely any faith "unexpressed" is an *incomplete* faith. When we insist on teaching that the conditions of salvation as a part of saving faith, namely repentance and baptism, are necessary to salva-

tion before salvation is realized, we are not making a "law" out of the Christian system, but are simply recognizing the full import of the "grace-faith system." Stipulated conditions for receiving a gift, such as endorsing a check, do not make the gift any less a gift and are in no sense to be thought of as earning or achieving the reward. In the same way baptism is not a work of merit. It is merely an expression of reliance upon and trust in the blood of Christ. It is in exactly the same position as endorsing the check. The endorsement indicates a confidence or trust that there is money in the bank to pay the check. But it is necessary to endorse the check before the gift is ours!

When we preach the *conditions* of salvation, however, we should not preach them as *replacing* Christ, but rather we should preach "Christ crucified" as a Saviour, and as being behind the conditions, and as that which gives them their only significance.

Baptism and "conditions" are required before justification, yet we are truly "justified by faith."

Personalia

John Scott is minister for the church in Swarthmore, Pennsylvania. He received his B.A. and B.S. degrees from ACC, his M.A. from the U. of Pennsylvania and is completing his Ph.D. at the latter institution. His special field of interest is Biblical Archæology.

Abe Malherbe is a South African studying in the States. He has received the B.A. at ACC, the S.T.B. from Harvard and is working on the Th.D. in N. T. backgrounds. He preaches for the church at Lexington, Mass.

Pat E. Harrell received his B.A. from ACC, his S.T.B. from Harvard and is a candidate for the Ph.D. from Boston U. in Early Church History. He preaches for the church at Natick, Mass.

J. D. Thomas has the B.A. from ACC, the M.A. from SMU and was recently awarded the Ph.D. by the U. of Chicago. He is an elder in the College church at Abilene, Texas, and Associate Professor of Bible at ACC.

James D. Willeford is minister of the Highland Church of Christ in Abilene, Texas and well-known as a speaker over the Herald of Truth (ABC) broadcast. He received his B.A. degree at ACC and has done graduate work at the U. of Wisconsin.

R. L. Roberts, Jr. is minister of the church in Alvord, Texas. He received his B.A. degree from ACC with a major in Greek. He has served the church at Alvord (twice) and the McGregor Park church of Houston as minister.

William B. Decker is Asst. Professor of Bible at ACC where he received his B.A. degree. He also has the M.A. degree from Butler U. and has done residence toward the Ph.D. at Southern Calif.

W. Everett Ferguson is associate minister for the Melrose congregation in Mass. He holds the B.A. and M.A. degrees from ACC and is working on his Ph.D. at Harvard in the field of Early Church History.

(Concluded on page 219)

The Spiritual Significance of Baptism

James D. Willeford

There is probably no subject in the entire range of Christian teaching on which the New Testament speaks more definitely and clearly than on the design of Christian baptism. And yet almost every conceivable view has been held regarding it, from that which attached to baptism a magical saving power, to that which rejects it altogether as worthless.

In our day it seems to be the opinion of many that baptism is no more than going into the water dry and coming out wet. It is common for some men to speak of baptism as "a mere outward act." Such a misplacing of baptism is responsible for much of the disregard in which it is held. Robbed of its scriptural beauty and purposes it loses its hold upon the human heart and clings to Christianity as a useless appendage, held there only by force of divine authority; tolerated for Christ's sake rather than welcomed as an answer to a deep spiritual yearning.

Baptism has more than a human aspect. It is an act of spiritual interflow, a rushing together of two personalities. The penitent believer is "baptized into Christ," and Christ, in his Spirit, comes into the soul, and bestows the assurance of sonship and of remission. A togetherness is reached more intimate than that of any human relation—we in Him and He in us.

Modern sentimentalism, in its weakening of moral obligations, takes offense at baptism as a condition of the remission of sins. But in doing so it breaks with the Scriptures for they declare that penitent believers must be baptized in order to obtain the remission of their sins (Acts 2:38; Acts 22:16).

If baptism is a mere formality, why retain it at all in a spiritual religion like Christianity? The force of this question is being felt, and some of the denominations are holding to the ordinance with a very feeble grasp. To regard baptism as a mere outward act and then place it in a useless position, is to put it on trial for its life. Nay, it is rather, to kill it and then withhold it from burial.

But the Scriptures declare that baptism is not a mere outward act—a mere washing of the body, or cleansing of "the filth of the flesh"—but a spiritual act (1 Pet. 3:21). It is a self-giving and a Christ-taking. No one can be "baptized into Christ" without both seeking to enter and being admitted into Christ. Being "in Christ" is a social relation and can as little be accomplished by one party alone as can marriage. The phrase "baptized into Christ" shows that baptism was regarded by the inspired apostles as an act of divine acceptance on the part of Christ. If anyone doubts this, let him try to define the meaning of being "in Christ" so as to exclude acceptance on the part of Christ, and he will discover the moral impossibility involved. "Baptized into Christ" is probably the most

comprehensive expression in the New Testament regarding baptism. It embraces, on its physical side, a burial and resurrection, and a washing or cleansing from guilt on the divine side. In its spiritual aspect there is an admission and an entering into Christ. Entering into Christ is the human part and admission into Christ is the divine part.

Some speak of baptism as "a door into the church," but it may be questioned whether this is a scriptural idea. Baptism is an *entering* into Christ—the welding of that bond between the soul and Christ, which is described as its being in Him, and He in it. The Bible teaches that when we enter Christ by baptism, we enter His body the church (1 Cor. 12:13 cf. Acts 2:38 T.R.).

There is one thing certain—namely, that God is present when one is scripturally baptized, for the Bible says that baptism is the "asking for a good conscience toward him" (1 Pet. 3:21). Baptism is the prayer of the soul for a clear record. If God is not present to hear this appeal of the heart, He but mocks it. The asking for a good conscience is probably referred to in Acts 22:16 when Ananias directs Saul to arise and be baptized and wash away his sins "calling on his (Christ's) name." This calling on the name of Christ, this prayer of the soul to him, is an act which presupposes that God is present and that He will answer this cry of a penitent heart. God is present at the baptismal scene of the convert, as He was at that of His own Son, and He is there for the purpose of admitting the penitent believer into a spiritual union with Himself.

One of the first things learned by studying the Bible teaching about baptism is the fact that the candidate does not baptize himself. In the Great Commission Christ instructs His disciples to do the baptizing (Matt. 28:18, 19). The import of this requirement is that baptism is performed by God, through an agent. It is God's act. So completely is this so, that the agent is allowed no discretionary power, but is commanded to perform a certain specific act on a particular kind of candidate; and, that he may know that the candidate is a proper subject, a confession of faith is required of him. When the person wishing to be immersed makes this confession the administrator is required to perform the act not in his own, but in God's name. The administrator therefore becomes an instrument—God's physical hand in baptizing men. His act is an administrative act of the Divine Being.

Since baptism is an act of God, one can better understand why the remission of sins is connected with it. If pardon, or the remission of sins, must of necessity be a divine act; if, under the figure of a washing, baptism is said to take away sin (Acts 22:16), and if it saves us (1 Pet. 3:21), it is clear that baptism must contain within itself a divine act—namely, the remission of sins. When anyone is washed, he is not cleansed *after* the act, but *in* and *by* it; -and when one is saved by anything, the saving takes place in the act which saves him, not after it. In Titus 3:5 we are said to be

saved "THROUGH the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit." Religious scholars of many churches testify that the washing of regeneration in Titus 3:5 is baptism. Thus, salvation takes place in baptism. The scriptures do not regard baptism simply as a condition to be complied with, after which salvation is granted, but as God's act, *in* and *through* which He saves us. When a man is washed he is not cleansed *before* the washing, but *in* and *by* it, and when a man is saved by anything he is not saved *before* that thing takes place, but *when* it takes place.

Since baptism contains within itself a double spiritual element,—a human giving and a divine receiving,—it is plain that it contains within itself something capable of taking away the guilt of sin. This power lies not in the water, not in the burial, not in the soul's giving up to Christ, but in the *divine acceptance*, which forms the spiritual part of baptism on its divine side. If this is true, baptism must, of course, be "for the remission of sins," and can be said to "wash away" sins, and it will be but natural to say that we are "saved by the washing of regeneration." The whole language in the New Testament regarding baptism thus becomes natural, and in perfect keeping with the spirit of Christianity.

One of the divine characteristics of Christianity is to be found in its stumbling-blocks. Christ became a stumbling-block by what He taught, by what He did, and most of all by what He demanded of men. On one occasion Christ commanded a rich ruler to "Go, sell all thou hast, and give to the poor, . . . and come, follow me." This demand of the Lord struck the ruler like a thunderbolt. Amazed, confounded, dumb, he stood. He stumbled—and went away sorrowing, for he was very rich. A few moments before he had been resting in the assurance that he was keeping the commandments, but like a gleam of lightning, Christ's demand upon him flashed into his soul, and revealed, not God enthroned there, but Mammon. The most fundamental of all the commandments he was breaking continually. He was not loving God with his "heart, his soul, and his might," and he was not loving his neighbor as himself, for he was hoarding his wealth, with abject poverty at his very door.

The stumbling-block Christ placed in the path of the rich ruler was a revelation to him. The stumbling-block Christ placed in his way was a test-act to determine the true condition of his heart. It unmasked his character and revealed to him the true motives of his heart. A stumbling-block is a demonstration. It forces the soul to self-revelation.

Baptism is a stumbling-block. It is a divine revelation of the individual soul. The New Testament reveals the truth from heaven; baptism reveals the heart. The New Testament meets human ignorance; baptism meets human blindness. The New Testament is sunlight; baptism is a searchlight.

But baptism is more than a revelation of one's heart. It is a winnowing-fan, separating the chaff from the wheat. It is ever

turning back the floodtides of the unspiritual seeking entrance among the redeemed. It is God's wall skillfully built to keep out those who are not penitent, and by this service it becomes a protector of the spirituality of the church. Take it away, and the world and the church would flow together, and the church would be lost in the sea of unredeemed humanity. He who strikes baptism deals a blow at the spirituality of the church.

A few years ago a preacher asked a large audience of worldly people how many of them wished to be saved in heaven. He said that every hand went up. This preacher then delivered a sermon, outlining what men must do to be saved. He stressed that in the accounts of conversions given in the New Testament people were required not only to confess their faith with their mouths, but were also required to demonstrate it by being baptized. He read to that audience the Scriptures in the book of Acts which say that men's sins are remitted or washed away when they are baptized (Acts 2: 38; 22:16). The preacher then asked the audience to stand and for everyone present to come forward and state his desire to be immersed into Christ. But not a person came! Why? Because it was easy to say they believed and that they wanted to be saved, but it was difficult to step out and prove their faith and love by a burial from all sinful attractions. If the preacher had said, "Only believe and take Christ as your Redeemer and that moment you are saved"—they would have done so at once! But theirs would have been a faith which could not break the earthly ties which Christ declares must be broken before one can become His disciple.

Let anyone recognizing the truth of Christianity, who hears *no* in his heart to baptism, take heed! It is a revelation of awful moment and is as certain as though spoken by a voice from heaven. It means that the heart is not right.

Baptism is failing to accomplish fully its high and holy ends because it is belittled and minimized by the churches. The great motive for cheapening baptism must be found in the fact that, as it stands in the gospel, it is displeasing to many. Baptism has had a stormy history and is still bending under a shower of adverse criticism. To many, this may seem sufficient proof that there is something wrong about it; but they forget that it is of the very nature of a stumbling-block that it should be "spoken against" and that this is one of the highest marks of its excellency and efficiency. Men never like that which causes them to stumble. But the disastrous thing about it is that the churches have largely joined in this adverse criticism, to the belittling and cheapening of baptism.

When a man of the world who thinks he is all right without Christ finds in his heart a *no* to baptism, if the churches join with him and say that it is a "mere outward act," a mere physical affair having no important relation to his conversion and that it is a "non-essential"—that it has nothing to do with his salvation,—it is for him utterly ruined as a test-act. The man takes no alarm at his

dislike for it and concludes that it is not his heart that is wrong, but baptism. In doing this, the churches have put out the searchlight that the gospel was carrying into that man's heart. Woe to those who put out lights in this dark world! Let such people take care lest they be found fighting against God. What would the New Testament be worth, should the churches decry it, belittle it, and discredit it before the world? It is high time to stop cheapening baptism. Honor it as a command of God, use it aright, and you have in your hand a mighty power for the conversion of men. It is designed to keep out the half-hearted. It is of vast importance to Christianity to keep out the ease-loving. Baptism ought *not* to be convenient. Christ's cross was not convenient, and our cross-bearing should not be. The science of biology teaches that ease-taking on the part of any creature results in degeneration. Ease-seeking in religion is nothing less than spiritual death, and all such tendencies should be resisted. Baptism, as a stumbling-block, should be built so high and strong as to repel all the unspiritual and ease-loving—every other being but the humble penitent fleeing with a broken heart to the arms of his Redeemer. Love is always heroic, and baptism should be a wall so high that the unheroic who are unwilling to sacrifice will not leap it. The early church was filled with heroic men and women whose faith shook the world. Their faith accomplished such great results because it was not weak but strong. When they came to God's command that men be immersed they obeyed without hesitation. The divine stumbling-block of baptism was a challenge which they met successfully. Will this generation's faith meet this challenge and prove the measure of its love?

This Name Baptist

R. L. Roberts, Jr.

John, the son of Zacharias and Elizabeth, made baptism in water such a central part of his ministry and his preaching was so characterized by the teaching of "baptism of repentance" that he was styled the "Baptizer" or the "Baptist." Since others after him also baptized, the title with the definite article applied to him may signify that John was the introducer of a religious rite of new significance.¹

The meaning of the term *baptistes* "baptist" has been the subject of some dispute and in some circles the use made of the name shows definite abuse and lack of good linguistic sense. The purpose of this short paper is to examine the meaning and use of the term.

The word is formed by the adding of a formative suffix (-tes, a suffix for expressing agency) to the stem *baptis-* thus making a noun that designates the agent by whom the action of the corresponding verb *baptizo* ("I baptize") is performed. Since "the termination -tes expresses the male agent,"² words formed with -tes show agency or action of male participants. In the chapter on *Word Formation* in their grammar, Robertson and Davis (Baptists) in discussing "Suffixes for Substantives" under (b) Agent say,

... suffixes for the agent are -ter, -tor, -tes. Masculine -ter like *so-ter* Saviour (*sozo*), feminine like *mathe-tria* the only New Testament example (Acts 9:36); masc. -tor, nom. *tor* like *praktor* *exactor* (*prass-o*), masc. -ta, nom. -te-s like *mathe-tes* learner (*manthan-o*), *baptis-te-s* baptizer (*baptiz-o*). The great majority of the words for the agent are formed in te-s. They are formed from many kinds of verbs as those in -oa like *akroa-tes* hearer from *akroa-omai*, those in -eo like *poie-tes* doer from *poi-eo*, those in -oo like *zelo-tes* zealot from *zel-oo*, those in -euo like *bouleu-tes* councillor from *boul-euo*, those in -azo like *dikas-tes* judge from *dik-azo*, those in -izo like *euaggelis-tes* evangelist from *euaggel-izo*, those in -uzo like *goggus-tes* murmurer from *gogg-uzo*.

¹The relation of John's baptism to Jewish proselyte baptism has been greatly disputed. W. F. Flemington, e. g., (*The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism*, London, SPCK, 1948) p. 3ff, assumes that John's baptism presupposes proselyte baptism. He cites Leipoldt (*Die Urchristliche Taufe im Lichte der Religionsgeschichte*, 1928) as saying that the similarities between the two baptisms are so significant that the contemporaries of John must have regarded his rite as a special kind of proselyte baptism. Flemington, however, admits that Strack-Billerbeck (*Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, Vol. 1, pp. 112f) makes a strong case in opposition to a connection between the two.

²Green, S. G., *Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek N. T.* (London, Religious Tract Society, 1907), p. 144.

³Robertson, A. T. and Davis, W. H., *A New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament* (New York, Harper & Brothers, 1938) pp. 172f; Robertson's big grammar: *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, (Nashville, Broadman Press, 1934) pp. 153f, has practically the same material in it.

Of the terminations mentioned above *-tes* is the one used most frequently and occurs in words formed in later Greek. Blass⁴ says that "new nouns to express the doer are formed in *-tes*" and lists another large group of examples. The list is little changed in the revision by Debrunner and the quotation is given from Blass-Debrunner translated into English:

New nouns of the agent have *-tes*, no longer *-ter*, or *-tor*; the feminine for this is *-tria* (Attic) not *-tris* or *-teira*. *baptistes*, *biastes*, *gogustes*, *dioktes*, *dotes* (old form *doter*), *hellenistes* ("one who [understand a 'Jew' who] speaks Greek, from *hellenidzein* "to speak Greek." Cf. *Ioudaidzein* (Sect. 108.3), *euaggelistes*, *lutrotes*, *meristes*. These words were built as, for example, Matthew 11:12 (*biadzetai-bastai*⁵), and John 4:20 (*proskunein-proskunetes*⁶) show, almost with the same ease as verbal forms. For *ependutes* "upper garment" John 21:7 (already in Sophocles) compare the German *uberzieher* and words like *dzoster* "girdle." Old forms are *soter*, *retor*, *praktor*, *alektor* ("cock" properly "fighter"). The feminine forms in *-tria*: *mathetria*, Acts 9:22.

It is certainly clear from the evidence given that *baptistes* ("Baptist") signifies an agent or doer—that is, one engaged in the work of baptizing. This is exactly what it shows in the case of John. Twelve times in the New Testament he is referred to as "The Baptist." Twice he is called "The Baptizer" (*ho baptizon*) (Mark 6:14, 24) where the construction is the articular participle equals "the one who baptizes" and these passages are in parallel passages to Matthew 14:2, 8 where the noun in the *-tes* form is used. Both these expressions denote the same fact—that John was occupied with baptizing. Thus Flemington says

ho baptistes-ho baptizon (Mk. 1:4; 6:14 etc.) That he was the agent administering the rite is also suggested by *ego . . . ebaptisa* (*baptizo*) Mk. 1:8 etc. and by *hup' autou* (Mk. 1:5 etc.)¹⁰

Harper's Lexicon defines *baptistes* as "one who baptizes, a baptist, Mat. 3:1; 11:11; et al. N.T."¹¹ Verily, there is no room for doubt about the meaning of the term.

⁴Blass, F. *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, translated by Thackeray, (London, Macmillan and Co. 1911), p. 62.

⁵"take by force—men of force."

⁶"worship—worshipper."

⁷Blass, Friedrich, and Debrunner, Albert, *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Gottingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1949, Achte auflage), pp. 52f.

⁸"I baptized."

⁹"of (by) him." The people were baptized by the agency of, at the hands of John.

¹⁰Flemington, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

¹¹*Analytical Greek Lexicon* (New York, Harper and Brothers) p. 65.

But let us notice just one more statement relative to the matter. Webster's *New International Dictionary* gives the following remarks concerning the English suffix *-ist*:

a suffix forming agent nouns . . . denoting, a. one who does, or makes a practice of (1) a given action, commonly expressed by a corresponding *verb* in *-ize*.¹²

From this we see that our word "Baptist" signifies the same thing as the Greek word *baptistes* from which it is taken. They have the same meaning and should always be used in the same way.

Since the ending of the name "Baptist" expresses the doer or male agent, John must have been baptizing when he was first called "the Baptist." If he were not and had not been baptizing when first called by the name, then it was a misuse of the term for anyone to call him "the Baptist" for it pictures him as a baptizer.

Philip was called "the evangelist" (*euaggelistes*, Acts 21:8), not *before* he evangelized but *because* he evangelized. The endings *-ist* and *-tes* in the words "evangelist" and *euaggelistes* express the same thing that they express in "baptist" and *baptistes*. So, if it were proper to call John by the name "Baptist" before he baptized (as this writer has heard it claimed), then it would be just as proper to call Philip an evangelist before he began the work of evangelizing.

Paul says that "God loveth a cheerful giver (*dotes*)," 2 Cor. 9:7. The word *dotes* denotes one who gives, as the word *baptistes* denotes the one who baptizes. No one would think of calling a person a "giver" who never gives anything to the Lord, and it would not be proper to refer to any individual as a giver when that individual never engages in the activity of giving. If one never gives, he is not a giver and should not be called such. But many are called "Baptist" who never engage in the act of baptizing. Why not call just anyone a "giver"? It would be just as proper.

This writer once heard the explanation of the term: "Well the ones who don't baptize at least give their consent to the deed." True, but most of those who don't give also believe in other people's giving. This ought to take care—once and for all—of the old explanation: "John baptized Jesus; that made Jesus a baptist; Jesus baptized the disciples and that made them baptists; they baptized others and thus we all became baptists!"

From the standpoint of the language used to refer to John, he was called "The Baptist" because he baptized. All evidence plainly shows this to be the case.

Alvord, Texas.

¹²Webster's *New International Dictionary* (G. & C. Merriam, Second Edition Unabridged) p. 1319.

Baptismal Confession

William B. Decker

On one occasion, during the personal ministry of Jesus, Jesus asked his disciples, "Who do men say that the Son of man is?" When they had given their various answers, he again asked them, "But who say ye that I am?" The answer to this question, as recorded for us in Matthew 16:16, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," becomes the basis of the Christian faith. Through the years this basic statement of faith has been analyzed and changed into various forms, being enlarged and shortened according to the whims and fancies of men through the ages. The purpose of this article, however, is not to discuss the details of this confession or the various changes that it may have undergone, but to investigate and come to some conclusion as to the nature of its use or a similar use of a confession made in a public way in connection with baptism. There are several passages of scripture which deal with this problem directly.

There is within the Gospel records definite expression of the fact that Jesus is considered as the Son of God. The particular statement made by Peter as recorded in Matthew 16 is expressive of this concept. From this primitive confession, to what extent did the early Christians develop a formula of confession? It is a definite fact, as stated by the variation in the Greek Text in Acts 8:37, that some type of confession was given. The consensus of opinion among the various commentators is expressed very well by F. F. Bruce:

This is the account in the original text. But at quite an early date (perhaps in the first decades of the second century) it was felt that this was not quite adequate. Philip surely must have satisfied himself first of the genuineness of the Ethiopian's faith. (No doubt he did so satisfy himself, but there are some minds that cannot be content to leave such things inferred.) So we find the Western addition which appears in the A V as vs. 37 (And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest, And he answered and said, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God") . . . This addition certainly reflects primitive Christian practice. When a convert was formally admitted to Christian fellowship by baptism, he made a public confession of his new faith, probably in response to a definite question.¹

Although there is some question about this passage's being in the original text, it expresses a very early concept of a definite confession made by the candidate for baptism.

The objection is textual only, and remarks such as that the words sound like some pedantic preacher asking his convert for a final, formal confession are unwarranted. A confession of Jesus as the Christ was always a prerequisite for baptism.²

¹F. F. Bruce. *Commentary on the Book of the Acts*. (Grand Rapids, Michigan. Wm. B. Eerdmans' Publisher. 1956) p. 189.

²R. C. H. Lenski. *The Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles*. (Columbus, Ohio. The Wartburg Press. Copyright 1946) p. 346.

If this were the only passage, it could be passed off simply as a later addition or expansion; however, there are other passages that imply if not specifically state such a confession. Heb. 3:1; 4:14; and Matt. 10:32-33 may well refer to the whole life of a Christian as a means of confessing Christ. But Rom. 10:9-10; Phil. 2:11; and I Tim. 6:12 seem to refer to a specific type of confession.

Rom. 10:9-10, "because if thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved: for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." The resurrected Jesus is the object of the faith which justifies (vv. 4-6 cf. I Cor. 15:1 ff). Paul has just expressed this idea in the preceding verses and then tells the Roman Christians that their hope is based on their faith and confession. These are the rudiments on which Christian living is founded. The "if" in this passage does not express doubt as some might feel from the English translation, but, as Lenski states, it states the actions in their finality:

As 'ho poiesas' in vs. 5 is an aorist, so here the two verbs, "shall confess—shall believe," are also aorist, for both actions are conceived, not in their progress, but in their finality; and the futurity expressed by "shall be saved" sets in as the immediate result.³

The Roman Christians had believed and they had confessed, thus the force of this statement upon them. This passage definitely identifies confession as an act of Christian obedience. We do not have the specific formula stated, but we do have the specific statement of the act.

Phil. 2:9-11, "Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." In this passage, Paul exalts Christ to his high position and reminds the Philippians of the confession which they made at their baptism. He implores that they realize the significance of their confession. The comments of the authors of the *Interpreter's Bible* are interesting:

There can be little doubt that he repeats the confession which every convert made at his baptism. As yet there was no formal creed to which assent was necessary. Nothing was required but the affirmation that one accepted Jesus as one's Master. The later creeds all grew out of this baptism confession, which was not a creed but simply an oath of loyalty.⁴

³R. C. H. Lenski. *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*. (Columbus, Ohio. The Wartburg Press. Copyright 1945) p. 657.

⁴Scott, E. F. *The Interpreter's Bible*. Vol. 11. (George A. Buttrick, Commentary Editor. Nashville. Abingdon Press. 1955) p. 51.

Marvin Vincent in his comments of this passage expresses the same general idea, but with this additional thought: "It is the confession that is to the glory of God, not the fact that Christ is Lord."⁵ This confession of which Paul is speaking here must have reference to the confession made in becoming a Christian and thus associated with baptism.

In I Tim. 6:12, these words are recorded: "Fight the good fight of the faith, lay hold on the life eternal, whereunto thou wast called, and didst confess the good confession in the sight of many witnesses." This passage has been interpreted in various ways with respect to the idea of confession. Some have suggested that the confession is the one made when Paul took Timothy as his assistant or when he made him his representative for the Asian Churches. Others express the idea that it refers to the martyrdom of Timothy. The personal address and the force of the previous verses penned by Paul on confession seem to indicate that it is the baptismal confession referred to here. In this particular verse the phrase, "lay hold on the life eternal, whereunto thou wast called," most likely refers to the time of baptism. Lenski expresses this same idea and he speaks with a note of certainty on the idea of baptismal confession as well.

The acceptance of God's call is added: "and didst confess the noble confession in the presence of many witnesses." Combined, as this confession is, with the calling unto eternal life, it can signify only the confession made at the time of baptism and not what may have been confessed when Paul took Timothy as his assistant, or when he appointed him as his representative for the Asian Churches . . . We possess no formula of the confession which was made at the time of baptism at this early date; its substance we know, it was 'The Faith' for which the baptized confessors contended. That was a public confession: 'in the presence of many witnesses,' among whom we think Paul also regarded the angels (5:21) and not only the members of the congregation.⁶

As is seen in this quotation, Lenski definitely thinks there is sufficient evidence for the conclusion that there was a specific confession made in connection with baptism. In I Tim. 6:12, the confession must have been at baptism rather than later because of the significance of baptism itself. Baptism is thought of as being related to rebirth and eternal life.

The good confession is the baptismal confession, 'Jesus is Lord' (Rom. 10:9; 1 Cor. 12:3; Phil. 2:11), or an elaboration of it.

⁵M. R. Vincent. *Philippians and Philemon*. International Critical Commentary. (New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1897) p. 63.

⁶R. C. H. Lenski. *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians, to the Thessalonians, to Timothy, to Titus, and to Philemon*. (Columbus, Ohio. The Wartburg Press. Copyright 1946) pp. 716-717.

Baptism was the time when men were effectively called to eternal life. In the pagan world, as in the non-Christian world today, baptism, as the rite of passage from the world to the church, as rebirth from this present evil world of darkness into the kingdom of the Son of God's love, was an act of public confession effectively separating the Christian from the world and establishing him in the Church.⁷

Some have interpreted this passage as referring to the martyrdom of Timothy because of the statement in vs. 13, however, this expression is made in the *Interpreter's Bible*, which seems to offer a reasonable refutation.

A simpler and probably better explanation, however, will rather integrate vs. 13 a and b into the baptismal liturgy current in Asia. On the one hand, baptism was commonly associated with rebirth and resurrection, hence the relevance of the clause, 'God who gives life,' to the baptismal liturgy. Furthermore, at baptism the Christian was reminded that Jesus was loyal to the death, so the vows which he was now assuming might also lead him before Roman governors and require a similar 'good confession.'⁸

As is seen in these verses and comments, there seems to have been a public confession of faith on the part of the candidate for baptism in connection with his baptism. There may or may not have been a particular formula used in the early church. If there was such, it has not been preserved for us other than in the expression found in Matt. 16:16, "Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God," or as implied in the expansion in Acts 8:37, ". . . I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God."

During the early history of the church, this public confession which was made at baptism was varied and increased until the creeds of later times were developed. During these years from the beginning of the church until the present time there have been those who have spoken out against the various creeds and confessions imposed upon men. It is particularly significant that the more recent commentaries acknowledge the simplicity of the early confession of faith. This is not a new concept, however, because it was one of the distinct cries of the early nineteenth century made by the men of that period such as Walter Scott and Alexander Campbell. A. S. Hayden, in his book on the Restoration movement records a number of statements made by Walter Scott and others concerning baptismal confession.

The style of speech indicated the change of thought. Sect language gradually gave place to Scriptural terms and phrases, as more appropriate and correct and authorized by the sanction of the Holy Spirit. Instead of 'relating a Christian ex-

⁷Gealy, F. D., *The Interpreters Bible*. Vol. 11. (George A. Buttrick, Commentary Editor. Nashville. Abingdon Press. 1955) p. 453.

⁸*Ibid.* p. 454.

perience,' converts now began to 'confess their faith in Christ.'⁹ As this quotation indicates, there was a change that began at this time. Religious people were interested in destroying the creeds and confessions that had caused divisions among them and revert to the simple primitive baptismal confession. Walter Scott preached for the first time in Deerfield on Nov. 7, 1828. At the conclusion of this sermon, this statement was made:

Clear the way and let the people come and confess in Jesus Christ and be pardoned.¹⁰

After another sermon by Walter Scott three persons came forward and Scott made this statement:

He asked them if they believed with all their heart that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. 'These persons,' said he, 'will be baptized tomorrow after the sermon, for the remission of their sins.'

These quotations from the restoration period have been cited as an example of the understanding of these men of the confession made by the early New Testament Christians.

The passages of scripture, Rom. 10:9-10; Phil. 2:11; and I Tim. 6:12 along with the early testimony of Acts 8:37, as recorded in the Western Text, definitely show that a confession was made in public in connection with baptism. It expressed the basic truth that the individual being baptized believed that Jesus was the Christ the Son of God. This confession was not so much a creed as a statement of loyalty to Christ and his way of life. The expansion of this confession led to the confessions of faith which later added to the confusion and division within the church. In almost every age, men such as those in the restoration period have discouraged these formal creeds, and they have encouraged a return to the simple New Testament confession given by Peter, as recorded in Matt. 16:16, "Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God."

⁹A. S. Hayden. *A History of the Disciples on the Western Reserve*. (Cincinnati, Ohio. Chase and Hall, Pub. 1875) p. 54.

¹⁰*Ibid.* p. 322.

¹¹*Ibid.* p. 97. The story of Scott's work is of special significance in the churches of Christ today. It was at this place that the common practice of telling a "religious experience" or confessing that "God for Christ's sake has pardoned my sins" as baptismal testimonies were rejected and the primitive confession was restored.

Baptism from The Second to The Fourth Century

Everett Ferguson

It is interesting to observe that the New Testament doctrine of baptism is confirmed by the beliefs and practices of the early church. However, the period under review also shows the process by which the New Testament ordinance was transformed into the Medieval sacrament for the remission of original sin. This article will note the important second century references to baptism, describe the ceremony of baptism as it was observed in the West at the beginning of the third century, review of the third century controversy about administrator of baptism, detail the beginnings of infant baptism and the rise of substitutes for immersion, relate the standard baptismal practice in the fourth century in the East, and conclude with the evidence afforded by early baptisteries and paintings. The concern will be with both the *doctrine* of baptism and the *description* of the rite, the *meaning* of the act and the *manner* of its performance.

Second century church writers speak of baptism in such a way as to show that by it they meant the immersion in water of a penitent believer for the forgiveness of sin. Each of these items is implied in the brief reference of the Epistle of Barnabas, dated about A.D. 130, chapter 11:

Concerning the water, indeed, it is written, in reference to the Israelites, that they should not receive that baptism which leads to the remission of sins, but should procure another for themselves. . . . We indeed descend into the water full of sins and defilement, but come up, bearing fruit in our heart, having the fear of God and trust in Jesus in our spirit.¹

The *Shepherd* of Hermas, which may have been written as early as 110 is very clear about remission of sins being received in baptism:

"The tower which you see building is myself, the Church. . . . Hear then why the tower is built upon the waters. It is because your life has been, and will be, saved through water. For the tower was founded on the word of the almighty and glorious Name, and it is kept together by the invisible power of the Lord." (*Vision* III:3)

"I heard, sir, some teachers maintain that there is no other repentance than that which takes place, when we descended into the water and received remission of our former sins." He said to me, "That was sound doctrine which you heard; for that is really the case. For he who has received remission of sins ought not to sin any more, but to live in purity." (*Commandment* IV:3)

¹Although not always the best translation available, the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* (American Reprint Edition; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951) is the text used, except where otherwise indicated, as being most accessible to readers and providing uniformity of rendering.

It may be noted here that in the early centuries no one within the main stream of Christian doctrine denied that baptism was "in order to obtain" the remission of sins and, therefore, under ordinary circumstances necessary to salvation.

The earliest instructions preserved on how to administer baptism is found in a document emanating from Jewish Christian circles, probably in Syria, about 110, the *Didache*. Jewish proselyte baptism may condition some of the preferences. Chapter 7 states as follows:

Concerning baptism, thus baptize ye: Having first said all these things,² baptize into the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, in living³ water. But if thou have not living water, baptize into other water; and if thou canst not in cold, in warm. But if thou have not either, pour out water thrice upon the head into the name of Father and Son and Holy Spirit. But before the baptism let the baptizer fast, and the baptized, and whatever others can.

The word translated "pour out," from *ekcheo*, is the regular word for pouring out a copious amount. It is the word for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2. Thus it suggests covering the body as nearly as possible in imitation of an actual immersion, commanded by the word "baptize." Even for exceptional cases this permission of a substitute is unique in the literature prior to the middle of the third century.

The manner and the meaning of baptism are both set forth in the first *Apology* of Justin Martyr, chapter 61, at the middle of the second century.

I will also relate the manner in which we dedicated ourselves to God when we had been made new through Christ; lest, if we omit this, we seem to be unfair in the explanation we are making. As many as are persuaded and believe that what we teach and say is true, and undertake to be able to live accordingly, are instructed to pray and to entreat God with fasting, for the remission of their sins that are past, we praying and fasting with them. Then they are brought by us where there is water, and are regenerated in the same manner in which we were ourselves regenerated. For, in the name of God, the Father and Lord of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, they then receive the washing with water. For Christ also said, "Except ye be born again, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." . . .

. . . In order that we may not remain the children of necessity and ignorance, but may become the children of choice and knowledge, and may obtain in the water the remission of sins formerly committed, there is pronounced over him who chooses to be born again, and has repented of his sins, the name of God the Father and Lord of the universe. . . And this washing is called illumination, because they who learn these things are illuminated in their understandings.

In reference to this discussion by Justin it may be added that John

²The preceding moral instruction.

³*I. e.* "running."

3:5 was the favorite text, judging from the number of quotations, of early writers to show the necessity of baptism. "Regeneration" and "illumination" were regular designations for baptism, the central act of the process of the new birth and the climax of spiritual instruction. The benefits conferred in baptism were consistently stated to be the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit.⁴

The simple ceremony of the New Testament and Justin received considerable elaboration in the closing years of the second century. The *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus,⁵ about 215, details a baptismal ceremony. References to many of the items in the writings of Tertullian, especially in his treatise "On Baptism," confirm their existence in the closing years of the second century. An outline of the ceremony with its preliminaries and consequents follows: (1) *Catechumenate*—A period of instruction as "hearers of the Word" preceded a person's being admitted to baptism. Hippolytus requires the longest period of any of our sources, three years, but says character and not length of time is the decisive thing in determining when one is ready for baptism (*Apos. Trad.* 17). (2) *Preliminary interrogation*—Questions designed to determine the moral proof of repentance were answered by the candidate in the presence of a sponsor who testified to his worthiness (*Apos. Trad.* 20:21). Tertullian's "On Baptism" 18 indicates the presence of sponsors at the baptism itself. (3) *Period of Preparation*—On the Thursday before the Sunday on which the baptism was to take place the candidate began a period of fasting, prayer, bathing, and exorcism according to Hippolytus (*Apos. Trad.* 20), and of fasting, prayer, and confession of sins according to Tertullian (*On Baptism* 20). Such means of adding to the solemnity must have begun early. (4) *Renunciation of the World and Exorcism*—The ceremony proper began with a formal renunciation of "the Devil, his pomp, and his angels" (a verbal repentance), after which a presbyter anointed the person with the oil of exorcism as a symbol that he was free from demon possession (*Apos. Trad.* 20; 21; *On the Crown* 3). In the preceding period of preparation, according to Hippolytus, the bishop drove out any demons living in a person by the invocation of the name of Jesus. It was an age that believed in many demons and part of the appeal of Christianity was its promise of triumph over the "spiritual hosts of wickedness." (5) *Invocation on the Water*—Tertullian says any water is suitable for the baptism, but it is first consecrated for the

⁴Other pertinent references include Irenaeus, *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* 3; Hermas, *Similitude* IX:16:1-7; Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho* 14, 43, 138; Clement of Alexandria, *Instructor* I: 6; Theophilus, *ad Autolyicum* II:16). The reader is also referred to the excellent article by Kirsopp Lake, "Baptism (Early Christian)," *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918), Vol. II, pp. 384-390.

⁵The edition followed is that of B. S. Easton, *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus* (Cambridge: University Press, 1934).

purpose by a prayer to God to send His Holy Spirit to give cleansing power to the water (*On Bapt.* 4; *Apos. Trad.* 21). This may be regarded as a first step in regarding the water as water, when consecrated by the use of the divine name, as having saving power. (6) *Confession of Faith and Trine Immersion*—As the person confessed his faith in each of the three persons of the Godhead he was dipped following each confession (*Apos. Trad.* 21; *On Bapt.* 6). Tertullian admits in *On the Crown*, chapter 3, that the triple immersion is not in the Gospel. Its origin is obscure. Later writers explained it as symbolizing the three persons of the Trinity or the three days Jesus was in the tomb. These statements would sound like explanations after the fact. The former may have some truth in that it is possible that the origin of trine immersion is to be found in the Christological controversies at Rome in the late second century, the repetition being a thrust at the various monarchians. Or, more simply the formula “into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit” may have suggested the symmetry of plunging the person with each name. At any rate, the practice is not derived from the word *baptizo*, although the *izo* ending is properly repetitive, for *baptizo* is used for each single dipping.⁶ (7) *Anointing with Oil*—This is taken by Tertullian as a sign of one’s becoming a priest, on the analogy of the Old Testament (*On Bapt.* 7). In the *Apostolic Tradition* (21 and 22) there are two anointings with the “oil of thanksgiving”—one on emerging from the water and one in the assembly, the latter corresponding to the laying on of hands mentioned by Tertullian. (8) *Laying on of Hands*—This was done by the bishop on the analogy of the Apostles conferring spiritual gifts through this means and is connected by Tertullian with the reception of the Holy Spirit, apparently at this time and not in baptism although the latter was the prevailing view (*On Bapt.* 8; *Apos. Trad.* 22). This rite of extending fellowship and pronouncing a blessing developed in the West into the sacrament of confirmation. (9) *Kiss of Peace*—This may have been a part of all services as a symbol of brotherly love (*Apos. Trad.* 22). (10) *Baptismal Eucharist*—The newly baptized then joined the congregation in celebrating the Lord’s Supper (*Apos. Trad.* 23). Milk and honey were also given to the newly baptized (*On the Crown* 3) as food for a new babe.

The basic New Testament pattern of conversion is discernible in the above elements—a period of instruction, repentance, confession of faith, immersion into the Divine Name, and acceptance into fellowship. But there has taken place an elaboration and systematization, the latter of which may be partly the work of Hippolytus himself. The organized period of preliminary instruction permitted the saving of baptisms for certain periods of the year—Passover and Pentecost being the preferred times (*On Bapt.* 19).

⁶Since *baptizo* is the usual word in secular Greek for the sinking of a ship and the drowning of a person (rather thorough submergings!), the *-izo* ending may have had a certain intensive force.

Tertullian states that baptism could be administered, in order of preference, by a bishop, a presbyter, a deacon, or if need be by any disciple (*On Bapt.* 17). However, Tertullian drew the line on recognition of baptism administered in heretical bodies: "I am not bound to recognize in them a thing which is enjoined on me, because they and we have not the same God, nor one—that is, the same—Christ. And therefore their baptism is not one with ours" (*On Bapt.* 15). Clement of Alexandria also spoke of heretical baptism as "not true and proper water" (*Stromata* I:19). Thus it seems that against the Gnostics of the second century the principle was generally accepted that baptism administered by heretics was not valid. In view of the great doctrinal errors of the Gnostics, which means that they didn't have a right faith according to Tertullian, this position was valid.

In Asia Minor where fantastic sects continued to flourish the above view remained, and converts from heretical bodies received "true baptism" for the first time in the Church.⁷ The practice of Rome, however, was to receive those who had had heretical baptism into communion by the laying on of the hands of the bishop. This procedure may have been derived from the treatment of those baptized in the Church who fell away and then returned as penitents, or from the manner of dealing with those not in serious doctrinal error but only in schism as regarded the Roman bishop. The divergent practices produced a heated controversy in the mid-third century. Cyprian, the bishop of Carthage, held to be a "re-baptism" of heretics and schismatics alike. He was opposed by the Roman bishop Stephen who recognized the baptism of all who used the name of the Trinity.

Cyprian, with a sacerdotal and sacramental view of church officers reasoned, "How can he cleanse and sanctify the water who is himself unclean, and in whom the Holy Spirit is not? . . . Or, how can he who baptizes give to another remission of sins, who himself, being outside the Church, cannot put away his own sins?" (*Epistle* 69:1). Cyprian's premises are evident from these statements—the validity of baptism is in some way dependent on the administrator. He argued as Tertullian had done that there must be a right faith (*Ep.* 72:4-6), implying that this pertained to the administrator as well. Furthermore, his strong view of the unity of the Church led Cyprian to extend his view to include a denial of remission of sins to those guilty of causing division (*Ep.* 75:1, 7). Against the practice of the Roman church he made the following argument:

Or if they attribute the effect of baptism to the majesty of the name, so that they who are baptized anywhere and anyhow, in the name of Jesus Christ are judged to be renewed and sanc-

⁷See Firmilian's letter to Cyprian, *Epistle* 74 in the *corpus* of the latter's works.

tified; wherefore, in the name of the same Christ, are not hands laid upon the baptized persons among them, for the reception of the Holy Spirit? Why does not the same majesty of the same name avail in the imposition of hands, which, they contend, availed in the sanctification of baptism? (*Ep.* 73:5).

Stephen's position is known only from what his opponents say about him, but he seems to have relied chiefly on the tradition of the Roman church and a claim to correctness of practice as a successor of Peter. Although Stephen made proto-papal claims, it is clear that these were not recognized by his antagonists. Cyprian eloquently opposed truth to custom, and found no room in his conception of the unity of the Church for any necessity for communion with the Roman see.

The anonymous author of *On the Rebaptism of Heretics* added to the Roman argument (that sound faith was not necessary in the administrator and that the divine name possessed peculiar powers) a rationalization which turned the flank of Cyprian's position and cleared the way for a general acceptance of a more liberal view. He said that heretical baptism did not of itself confer the gift of the Spirit, but created a possibility of spiritual receptiveness which made the repetition of baptism superfluous. The imposition of hands supplied all defects. Thus one might receive water baptism as a heretic, and "Spirit baptism" at entrance into the Church through the laying on of hands.⁸

Although slow of acceptance in the East, the Roman position won the approval of the General Council of Nicaea in 325 and the Council of Carthage in 348.⁹ In general practice the baptism of schismatics was admitted and careful scrutiny was applied to the baptism of those coming from heretical groups. Similar issues were at stake in the later Donatist controversy (occasioned by an insistence on the moral worthiness of the administrator), which called forth the formulations of Augustine, the normative statement for Roman Catholicism on the relation of baptism to the doctrine of the Church.

On the basis of the premises about the nature of the Church and of the clergy Cyprian had logic on his side, but Stephen had practicality. Although Stephen's position was basically accepted, caution was applied to the wholesale acceptance of heretical baptism. Certainly Cyprian had gone too far in rejecting every baptism not administered within the "catholic" church. The controversy had a two-fold significance for the history of baptism: (1) the assumption common to both parties that there can be only one baptism and this

⁸For this controversy see the article by H. G. Wood, "Baptism (Later Christian)," in the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. II, pp. 390ff.

⁹Philip Schaaf, *History of the Christian Church* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1952), Vol. II, p. 265.

is essential to salvation; (2) the conclusion that water and the trine name are essential to a valid baptism.¹⁰ The latter is significant both for what it includes and what it omits. In later developments, the right formula pronounced at baptism ("into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit") was regarded as a prerequisite of a valid baptism, but the possession of faith was not regarded as an essential. Thus the basis for the efficacy of baptism was transferred from the New Testament principle of faith to the sacramental principle of water consecrated to saving power by the correct formula. In denying that the validity of baptism had any relation to the administrator of the act, Stephen and later Augustine recovered a genuine New Testament principle (*i.e.* who administers the act is a matter of indifference). They did so without reference to the New Testament and under unusual circumstances. In the Cyprianic and Donatist controversies two lines of development in church history came into conflict. There was developing a sacramental and sacerdotal principle which vested validity only in acts performed by an accredited hierarchy. Parallel to this there was spreading in regard to the doctrine of baptism an emphasis on water apart from other aspects. In the third and fourth century controversies the latter principle won out—the water had sufficient saving power that the administrator could not affect it. In no other area was the hierarchical principle checked. For the sake of practicality, an exception was made in the case of the "saving sacrament."

In the time of Cyprian infant baptism was generally accepted. The task at hand is to establish the time of the beginning of the practice. Early Christian feeling held to the innocence of babes. Describing faithful Christians, Hermas says, "They are as innocent babes, and no evil enters into their heart, nor have they known what wickedness is, but have ever remained in innocence" (*Similitude* IX: 29). More explicit is the Syriac text (probably original at this point) of the *Apology* of Aristides, about 125: "And when a child has been born to one of them (Christians), they give thanks to God; and if moreover it happen to die in childhood, they give thanks to God the more, as for one who has passed through the world without sins" (chapter 15). Such a feeling plus the stress on baptism for the remission of sins makes reasonable the absence of any early mention of infant baptism.

The earliest probable reference to infant baptism is found in Irenaeus, *c.* 180: "He came to save all through means of Himself—all, I say, who through Him are born again to God—infants, and children, and boys, and youths, and old men" (*Against Heresies* II:22: 4). "Born again" was a regular phrase in Irenaeus and other early church writers for baptism. Earlier references which are claimed

¹⁰Wood, *op. cit.*

have no element of necessity about them and none of the degree of likelihood which this one has. Shortly after Irenaeus wrote there is clear information provided by Tertullian, who speaks as if the practice were just beginning and opposes it.

The delay of baptism is preferable; principally, however, in the case of little children. . . . The Lord does indeed say, 'Forbid them not to come unto me.' Let them 'come' then while they are growing up. . . . Let them become Christians when they have become able to know Christ. Why does the innocent period of life hasten to the 'remission of sins' (*On Bapt.* 18)

Tertullian would scarcely have made reference to an unknown practice, nor, as a traditionalist, condemned a generally accepted one.

Cyprian is the first clear exponent of the baptism of new-born babes, and he implies that it was long in vogue and generally accepted in North Africa. Fidus inquired of him about baptizing on the eighth day, on the analogy of circumcision. Cyprian and sixty-six of his colleagues in council said that the baptism should be administered immediately. He makes, however, no appeal to the New Testament or the Apostolic tradition in relating the decision of the council to Fidus.

If even to the greatest sinners, and to those who had sinned much against God, when they subsequently believed, remission of sins is granted—and nobody is hindered from baptism and from grace—how much rather ought we to shrink from hindering an infant, who, being lately born, has not sinned, except in that being born after the flesh according to Adam, he has contracted the contagion of the ancient death at its earliest birth, who approaches the more easily on this very account to the reception of the forgiveness of sins—that to him are remitted, not his own sins, but the sins of another. (*Ep.* 58)

Here is found, still imperfectly stated, the justification of infant baptism in terms of original sin, the view which came to prevail and found polished formulation in the doctrine of Augustine. Unlike most, Cyprian was consistent and advocated infant communion as well as infant baptism.

The matter seems to have been left to parental choice with no clear tradition established, for the fourth century *Apostolic Constitutions* contain the first ecclesiastical command to baptize infants: "Do you also baptize your infants, and bring them up in the nurture and admonition of God" (VI:15). All the early baptismal liturgies presuppose adult candidates, and the institution of sponsors to speak for infants was a clumsy accommodation. Many children of prominent Christians in the fourth century are known not to have been baptized. Indeed, one of the curious phenomena of the fourth century was the frequent delay of baptism to the last possible moment, the Emperor Constantine affording a famous example. Many felt that such an efficacious act should be reserved as long as possible, and there seems to have been more dread of unworthy reception than of risking no reception at all.

The Catacomb inscriptions offer interesting evidence on the sub-

ject of infant baptism. According to one collection, there are ninety known references to children, only nine of which mention baptism. Of those that can be dated only three are as early as the fourth century. One child is six and two are eight years old. Each is spoken of as "newly baptized," apparently because of approaching death. Although some of the inscriptions have been dated as early as the second century, there is no case of strictly infant baptism mentioned before 400.¹¹

It was outside the period of this article before infant baptism became universal, but the step which made it inevitable had been taken in the fourth century. Christianity became a state religion with Constantine, and such must look upon all citizens as in some sense within its fold. Infant baptism would naturally be expanded to accomplish this purpose. Throughout church history infant baptism has found its most congenial home within the framework of a national religion.

Infant baptism seems to be a clear example of a common occurrence in church history—a practice begins and only later is a theological justification formulated. John 3:5 laid hold on the imagination of the early church. Before the necessity of the new birth had been thought out parents began bringing their children for baptism to secure a place for them in the coming Kingdom. The prevailing emphasis on the remission of sins led to a defense of the practice in those terms.¹² It is striking that the first references to original sin occur shortly after the beginning of infant baptism. Had there not been a lack of balance in presenting the plan of salvation (an emphasis on baptism to the exclusion of other elements) infant immersing could never have become prevalent.

Apart from the *Didache*, evidence for pouring as a substitute for immersion is confined to cases of infirm or sick persons, hence the practice was called "clinical baptism" from *kline*, "bed." It was in the mid-third century that Cyprian gave a systematic defense of affusion against the many with doubts about its efficacy.

You have asked also, what I thought of those who obtain God's grace in sickness and weakness, whether they are to be accounted legitimate Christians, for that they are not to be washed, but sprinkled,¹³ with the saving water. . . . I think that the divine benefits can in no respect be mutilated and weakened. . . . In the sacraments of salvation, when necessity compels, and God bestows His mercy, the divine methods (*i.e.*,

¹¹D. B. Ford, *Studies on the Baptismal Question* (Boston: H. A. Young and Co., 1879), p. 300; and W. N. Cote, *The Archaeology of Baptism* (London: Yates and Alexander, 1876), p. 121.

¹²Wood, *op. cit.*

¹³Cyprian's word throughout the passage is *perfun-do*, sometimes rather misleadingly, as here, translated "sprinkle." Properly the word means "to pour," "to wash," or even "to bathe."

"abridgements"—E. F.) confer the whole benefit on believers; nor ought it to trouble any one that sick people seem to be sprinkled or affused, when they obtain the Lord's grace. . . . Whence it appears that the sprinkling also of water prevails equally with the washing of salvation; and that when this is done in the Church, where the faith both of receiver and giver is sound, all things hold and may be consummated and perfected by the majesty of the Lord and by the truth of faith. (*Ep.* 75:12)

Cyprian's only Scriptural support is certain Old Testament passages interpreted on the allegorical principle that every mention of water refers to baptism. Still Cyprian lays down four criteria for recognizing an affusion, which he calls in the same epistle "not proper baptism": a case of necessity, a special extension of the mercy of God, faith in the giver and recipient of baptism, and performance "in the church," that is by the church's sanction and hence his usual term for it—"ecclesiastical baptism."

The clinical baptism of Novatian in this period provides interesting evidence of how such was commonly regarded. Bishop Cornelius of Rome relates the story:

He fell into a severe sickness; and as he seemed about to die, he received baptism by affusion, on the bed where he lay; if indeed we can say that such a one did receive it. . . . This illustrious man forsook the Church of God, in which when he believed, he was judged worthy of the presbyterate through the favor of the bishop who ordained him to the presbyterial office. This had been resisted by all the clergy and many of the laity; because it was unlawful that one who had been affused on his bed on account of sickness as he had been should enter into clerical office.¹⁴

Affusion was slow in winning favor and continued to be confined to cases of emergency, being the exception as late as the ninth century.

Faced with the realities of persecution the early church formulated the doctrine of "baptism of blood" to cover the cases of believers in Christ who became martyrs without having received the "baptism of water." Although found as early as Tertullian, the doctrine is here given in the concise words of Cyril of Jerusalem.

If any man receive not Baptism, he hath not salvation; except only Martyrs, who even without the water receive the kingdom. For when the Saviour, in redeeming the world by His Cross, was pierced in the side, He shed forth blood and water; that men, living in times of peace, might be baptized in water, and, in times of persecution, in their own blood. For martyrdom also the Saviour is wont to call a baptism, saying, 'Can ye drink the cup which I drink, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?' (*Catechetical Lecture* III: 10).

It may be noted that only if there was an objective value attrib-

¹⁴Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* VI:43, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1952), Series II, Vol. I.

uted to baptism in New Testament times can the later developments be understood. Because baptism had a value, it was possible to view it as having a value in itself ("baptismal grace"). Likewise, because baptism was so important, substitutes were derived, substitutes which clearly had their origin in emergencies. Moreover, "if it was water that worked the cleansing, could the amount of water or the manner of application be essential?" Although Cyprian insists that it is God who acts, the atmosphere of thought was to move in the direction of emphasizing what the consecrated water does. Thus baptism came in the Middle Ages to be less the meeting of God's act and man's response and more an automatic communication of grace by virtue of the specially endowed water.

Moving to the fourth century, the Catechetical Lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem, delivered in 348, and the Apostolic Constitutions, especially Book VII, compiled in Syria or Palestine in the late fourth century, permit a reconstruction of a typical baptismal ceremony in the East. Little difference will be seen from the earlier Western rite, but a greater formality and elaboration of symbolism are in evidence. Following a period as *audientes*, "hearers," (who were allowed to remain in the worship service only for the Scripture reading and sermon) individuals became *photizomenoi*, "the ones to be illumined," by having their name registered as ready for baptism. To these latter Cyril addressed his lectures. At this time no one was allowed to witness the "mysteries" of baptism and the Lord's Supper, or hear them described, until the time of his initiation.

The *special preparation* for Baptism included (1) *penitence*—a course of strict devotion and penitential discipline added to the catechetical instruction (*Cat. Lect.* I and II); (2) *confession of sins*—an open confession to accompany the inward repentance (*Cat. Lect.* I. II); and (3) *exorcism*—performed several times during the period of instruction in the Church building (*Procat.* 9, 13f).

The *ceremony of baptism* itself contained the following elements: (1) *Renunciation of Satan*—In the outer chamber of the Baptistery, facing West, the candidate stretched forth his hand and said, "I renounce thee, Satan, and all thy works, and all thy pomp, and all thy worship" (*Cat. Lect.* XIX:2-8; *Apos. Const.* VII:41). (2) *Profession of Faith*—The candidate then turned toward the East and declared, "I associate myself with Christ" and recited the Creed (*Cat. Lect.* XIX:9; *Apos. Const.* VII:41).¹⁵ (3) *First Unction*—On passing to the inner chamber the Candidate put off his under-garment (in which he had made his profession) as an emblem of putting off the old man and was anointed with the oil of exorcism (*Cat. Lect.* XX:2,

¹⁵*Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, Series II, Vol. VII.

¹⁶Creeds had their origin in baptismal confessions of faith and were expansions of the declaration of faith in Christ.

3; *Apos. Const.* VII:42). (4) *Invocation on the Water*—The bishop's consecration imparted a new power of holiness:

Look down from heaven, and sanctify this water, and give it grace and power, that so he that is to be baptized, according to the command of Thy Christ, may be crucified with Him, and may die with Him, and may be buried with Him, and may rise with Him to the adoption which is in Him that he may be dead to sin, and live to righteousness. (*Apos. Const.* VII:43; cf. *Cat. Lect.* XX:3).

(5) *Trine Immersion*—Standing in the water the candidate made the "saving confession" (*Cat. Lect.* XX:4), probably in question and answer form, each response followed by an immersion (cf. *Apos. Const.* VIII:47; *Canon* 50).

Following the ceremony of baptism there was a *ceremony of chrism*, put on the same level by Cyril with Baptism and the Supper. Cyril regarded the anointing of the baptized with consecrated ointment as a sacramental act, representing the anointing of Jesus by the Spirit at His Baptism (*Cat. Lect.* XXI:1). This rite in the Eastern Church corresponded to the development of the Sacrament of Confirmation in the West. It seems that Cyril regarded baptism as conveying both remission of sins and the Holy Spirit, but as signifying only the former. Chrism signified the latter. It prepared the person for an active participation in Christian duties by releasing the power of the Holy Spirit (*Cat. Lect.* III, XXI; *Apos. Const.* VII, 22, 43, 44).

Archæology confirms the literary evidence. In the catacomb of St. Pontianus (Ponziano) is a chamber probably set apart for baptism. The water-pool is fed by a living stream. The reported measurements vary widely and it seems that a collection of debris and the use of the area for burial after the days of persecution have reduced the original size of the pool. The most reliable figures are 4 feet 7 inches and 4 feet 3 inches on the longer sides and 3 feet 3 inches on the two shorter ones. The depth varies from 3 feet 9 inches to 4 feet 8 inches.¹⁷

The oldest excavated church building, dating from the early third century, is located at Dura Europos. At one corner of the building is a recessed basin thought by most to have been a baptistery. The dimensions are as follows: length—5 feet 3 inches, width 3 feet 1 inch, and depth—3 feet 1 inch. This gives a diagonal of 6 feet.¹⁸

On the lower level of the cathedral at Tyre, built in 315, is a basin of white marble in the shape of a cross with 4 steps at either end leading down into it and with a hole on the level of the floor for letting out water. The extreme length is 5 feet 6 inches; depth is 3 feet; and width is 3 feet 7 inches.¹⁹

¹⁷Ford, *op. cit.*, p. 292.

¹⁸From class lecture by Dr. Immanuel Ben-Dor, Visiting Lecturer on Biblical Archæology, at Harvard University.

¹⁹Ford, *op. cit.*, p. 289.

Even the smallest of these places is ample for infant immersion and too large for an affusion. The steps suggest adult immersion. And it has been demonstrated that any adult could be immersed in each of these places by the Dunkers' method of the subject in a kneeling position having his head bent forward. Such is possible in an even smaller area.

After the Constantinian peace large separate buildings were constructed for the performance of baptism. This was done because the baptisms were confined to certain seasons of the year and it was the prerogative of the bishop of each province to preside at the rite. Both the building (*baptisterion*) and the pool (*kolumbethra*) were circular, or octagonal, probably in imitation of the Roman baths. Typical of several built in the fourth century is the "Baptistery of Constantine" near the Church of St. John in Lateran, Rome. Its pool is 25 feet in diameter and 3 feet deep to accommodate several dippings at once. The very existence of such baptisteries is an evidence for immersion.²⁰

There are four pictorial representations of baptism in the Catacombs, which have been placed within the first four centuries.²¹ In the Chapel of the Baptistery of St. Pontianus Jesus is represented as standing entirely nude up to the waist in water with John on the shore, his right hand on the Saviour's head. In the cemetery of St. Pretextatus is pictured a youth standing nude in shallow water with the right hand of the baptizer resting on the lad's head as if bending him forward. The Cemetery of St. Lucina has a fresco painting of John nearly naked on the bank with both hands stretched out clasping the hands of Jesus, whom he leads out of the water. Jesus is entirely nude and nearly up to his middle in water, in the act of walking out. Finally, there is a fresco baptism in the St. Callistus Cemetery. A youth is represented standing naked, half leg deep in the water while the baptizer's hand is resting on his head. Surrounding the head of the youth there is seemingly a shower-cloud as if of falling spray. This has been claimed to represent sprinkling but could as easily be a representation of the person arising from an immersion. It must be remembered that like the other pictures there is nudity, much water, and the hand *on* the baptizee—all of which are suggestive of immersion as well as being totally out of place for some other act.

These representative pictures show that the often claimed support for affusion from early Christian art is more assertion than fact.

²⁰Ford, *op. cit.*, p. 287; Cote, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

²¹Ford, *op. cit.*, pp. 292ff; Reproductions in Cote.

Baptism in The Medieval Church

Fausto Salvoni

Theological science in the old Middle Ages confined itself to the compilation of abstracts, anthologies, and collections of subjects that were handed down from the fathers of the first centuries. Towards the end of the 12th century when Scholasticism reached its climax, the theologians compiled the medieval systems of theology, the *Summae*, sumptuous and artistical temples of theological study. It is here impossible to inquire with accuracy about the single questions regarding baptism; therefore I am obliged only to touch the principal subjects.

I. The Constitution of Baptism

1. The definition of baptism

The definition that more than others is in harmony with the Bible and the primitive custom of the Church was given from an anonymous theologian who wrote a *Summa Sententiarum*.¹

Baptism is for him: "a plunging (into water) with invocation of the Trinity."² With the development of the sacred rite and the substitution of infusion for immersion, the definition underwent a change. Peter Lombard (d. 1160) says that baptism is "an outside washing of the body, with the pronouncement of some prescribed words."³ And the Catechism of the Council of Trent defines it as "a sacrament of regeneration made by water with the pronouncement of some words."⁴

2. The element of baptism

The element is water. The popes of Rome sustained ever this point with great inflexibility. Innocent III (1198-1216) denied the validity of a baptism made by spittle because it was impossible to

¹This man was formerly identified with Hugo von St. Victor (1096-1141); therefore the *Summa* is printed by Migne among his writings. Now many scholars ascribe it to Odo of St. Victor, who was a pupil of Hugo, bishop of Lucca (Italy) and who died in the year 1146. He was protector of Peter Lombard and influenced the composition of his famous textbook *Sententiarum libri Quator*. Other scholars ascribe the *Summa Sententiarum* to Hugo of Mortagne, but this ascription is probably unacceptable. See M. Chossat, *La Somme des Sentences, oeuvre de Hugues de Mortagne vers 1155*, Louvain 1923.

²"*immersio facta cum invocatione Trinitatis*," *Summa Sententiarum* V, IV in Migne, PL, 176, 129.

³"*ablutio corporis exterior facta sub forma praescripta verborum*" IV *Sententiarum*, distinctio 3. This definition is commended also by Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, p. III, q. LXVI a. 1.

⁴"*Sacramentum regenerationis per aquam in verbo*," Pars II, c. II, n. 5. The first printing of this catechism was made in Rome in the year 1566.

find water.⁵ Gregory IX (1227-1241) openly sustained in his letter to the archbishop of Norway the invalidity of a baptism administered by beer.⁶ The sentence of pope Stephen II (752-757), who, on the contrary, sustained the validity of a baptism made by wine instead of water⁷ does not seem authentic.

The custom of consecrating the baptismal water is very old. Tertullian (d. after 200) speaks already of it.⁸ This consecration was made in the beginning by insufflation, but afterward by some chrisme that was shed in it.⁹ But all the medieval theologians, against the former doubts of Cyprian, teach the validity of pure water for baptism.¹⁰ Pope Benedict XII (1334-1342) in the book *Jam dudum* sent in the year 1341 to the Armenians teaches the sufficiency of water for baptism without the chrismation and the communions considered from them as necessary.¹¹

3. The contact between body and water

There were two means in the Middle Ages by which the baptismal water was put in contact with the body: (a) immersion and (b) infusion.

(a) *Immersion*. Immersion was the ordinary way for baptism till the 13th century. Thomas Aquinas (1226 or 1227-1274) wrote in his *Summa Theologica* this custom "is the more diffuse and commendable manner" of baptizing.¹² In the West this use continued till the 15th or 16th century, while in the East it is even today the lone fashion of baptizing.¹³

⁵D. n. 412 from the epistle "*Non ut apponeres*" written to archbishop Thoriam the 1 March 1206, "*postulasti, utrum parvuli sint pro christianis habendi, quos in articulo mortis constitutos . . . aliquorum simplicitas caput ac pectus ac inter scapulas pro baptismo salivae conspersione linivit . . . Dubitare non debes, illos vere non habere baptismum.*"

⁶D.n. 447: "*non debent reputari rite baptizati qui in cerevisia baptizantur.*"

⁷Hefele-Leclercq, III, 2 p. 925. "If someone baptizes a dying child by wine, because he has no water, he shall not be punished, and the children last in their baptism." The italicized words are considered a gloss from Mansi, *Conciliorum Collectio amplissima* t. XII, c. 558-559.

⁸Tertullian, *De baptismo* 5, 9 in Migne, *PL* I, 1310.

⁹The chrisms was already used in the 5th century. Canon 6 of the Council of Auxerre in the year 578 (date dubious) speaks of it. For the precedent of insufflation and prayers see: I Corblet, *Histoire du sacrement du Baptême*, II (Paris 1882), pp. 107-112; H. Scheidt, *Die Taufwasser-weihegebete*, Munster in V. 1935.

¹⁰Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, p. III, q. 66, a. 4. The sentence of Cyprian is referred by the V Council of Carthage (year 255). See Migne, *PL* 3, 1077.

¹¹D. n. 542.

¹²"*hic modus baptizandi est communior et laudabilior*," *Summa Theologica*, p. III, q. 66, a. 7 ad 2um.

¹³The Ambrosian liturgy; that is, the liturgy of Milan has till today a remembrance of this ancient custom. The priest plunges partially the head of the child into the baptismal water.

(b) *Three immersions or one alone?* The Christian churches, except the Spanish Church, had the custom of plunging three times the person that was to be christened. Some theologians blamed the lone immersion of the Spanish Church as a custom suspected of Sabellianism¹⁴ and contrary to the Christian tradition.¹⁵ Also pope Gelasius I (556-561) taught that baptism must be made "by three immersions" (*trina mersione*).¹⁶

But Gregory the Great, bishop of Rome (590-604) sustained the validity of baptism made by a lone plunging "because where the unity of faith is existing, it is without damage the difference of customs in the churches."¹⁷ The Spanish Council of Toledo in the year 633 taught openly that the unity of the plunging symbolizes against the Arianism the unity of the divine nature.¹⁸ Every doubt was decisively removed by the Council of Worms, which in the year 868 asserted the sufficiency of a lone plunging for the validity of baptism.¹⁹ According to the belief of Thomas Aquinas baptism made by a lone immersion is valid, but the person reducing to one the usual three immersions made a deadly sin, because he despised the sacred rite of the church.²⁰

(c) *The infusion of the water.* In the 12th century began to be used also the infusion; that is, the shedding of some water on the

¹⁴This system of 2nd century thought the Son and Holy Spirit were only a revelation, a manifestation of the Father; therefore Father, Son and Holy Spirit are not three distinct persons. This accusation against the Spanish custom was made from St. Martin of Braga (born 510-520 and died 580) in his book *De Trina mersione*, written as an answer to the bishop Bonifacius. "By the lone name is showed the unity of the divine substance and by the three immersions is showed the distinction of the persons" ("*in uno unitas substantiae, trina mersione distinction trium ostenditur personarum*") Cf. the edition in J. S. d'Aguirre, *Collectio maxima Conciliorum Hispaniae*, ed. 2, t. III c. 203-206.

¹⁵This was the opinion of Alcuin (abbot of St. Martin of Tour from 735 to 804) in his epistle (90) to the inhabitants of Lion written in the year 798. Cf. Migne, *PL* 100, 289-290.

¹⁶D. n. 229.

¹⁷Epistle 43, Migne *PL* 77, 497. It was also the opinion of Ildephonse of Toledo, *Liber in cognitione baptismi unus* n. 117 Migne, *PL* 96, 159-160. Cp. S. Athanasius Braegelmann, *The Life and Writings of St. Ildephonse of Toledo*, Washington 1942.

¹⁸For the canon 6 of the Council IV of Toledo see Migne, *PL* 84, 367-368. The three immersions, said the council, are a symbol of the three days passed by Jesus in the sepulchre and of the three divine persons; the lone immersion is a symbol of the unity of the divine nature.

¹⁹Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, t. IV, 1 (Paris 1911), p. 462.

²⁰"*graviter peccaret aliter baptizans, quasi ritum Ecclesiae non observans, nihilominus tamen esset baptismus*," *Summa Theologica* p. III, q. 66, a. 8.

head of the baptized persons. This rite was formerly reserved for sick people. Alexander of Hales (d. 1245) is the first writer that speaks of a baptism made "by pot or cup."²¹ The theologians adduced many, many reasons for this new custom: the great number of persons, the want of water, the weak health of the baptized.²²

This innovation excited the contrariety of the English bishops who the 27 of July 816 in the synod of Celchyt (= Chelsea) asserted the necessity of immersion for baptism on the grounds that the lone shedding of some water on the head of the persons is unacceptable.²³ Leclercq, t. IV, 1 p. 9.

But afterward the Council of Ravenna in the year 1311 sustained openly the validity and the liceity of this new form of baptism, it being possible to baptize "by three aspersions or three immersions."²⁴ When the children cannot be plunged into water without damage, the godfathers are obliged to sustain them whilst the priest sprinkles them by water saying the baptismal words.²⁵ This rite is not in opposition to Romans 6:4, says Thomas Aquinas, the immersion there supposed as a symbol of the burial is existing partially also in the infusion, because also in this rite a bodily portion is put under the water.²⁶

The rite of infusion, being more practical than the immersion, be-

²¹"*in pelvi vel scypho*," *Universae Theologiae Summa*, pars IV, quaestio XIII, membrum IV, articulum 1.

²²The danger of illness was greater when the children were baptized soon after their nativity. The water was for them too cold or often too soiled. This peril was formerly lesser, because the baptism was made only two times per year; that is, in the eves of Easter and of Pentecost, when the children, in greater number, were some months old and the water was lukewarm because of the sunlight and the surrounding air.

²³Mansi, *Collectio Conciliorum amplissima*, t. XIV, c. 355; Hefele

²⁴"*sub trina aspersione vel immersione*"; it is the canon XI. See Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles* VI, 1 (Paris 1914) p. 638; Mansi, *Conciliorum Collectio amplissima* t. XXV, c. 450.

²⁵Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles* VI, 2 (Paris 1915) p. 1435 (It is the canon 3); Mansi, q.w., XXVI, c. 568.

²⁶*Summa Theologica* p. III, q. 66, a. 7 ad 2um "*sed in aliis modis baptizandi repraesentatur aliquomodo (sepultura Christi) . . . nam quocumque modo fiat ablution, corpus hominis, vel aliqua pars ejus aquae supponitur*"

came by time the lone custom of the Roman Church.²⁷ We can, in harmony with Corblet,²⁸ present this summary of the historical variations about baptism, grounded on the teaching of the theologians and on the ecclesiastical monuments and pictures²⁹:

- a) Centuries 4-7: partial or total immersion in the baptistries
- b) Centuries 7-11: complete and vertical immersion of the children in the baptismal fonts
- c) Centuries 11-13: horizontal and complete immersion in the baptismal fonts
- d) Centuries 12-14: complete immersion or infusion
- e) Centuries 15-16: commonly infusion; sometimes partial immersion with infusion, seldom complete immersion

(d) *What member must receive the baptismal water?* The infusion must be made on the head, wrote Thomas Aquinas: "because here is the principal portion of the body; here are acting all the other members; here the activity of the soul is specially showing her power."³⁰

Against the subsequent ecclesiastical custom of baptizing conditionally also the children that are in the mother's womb when it is in danger of death, Thomas Aquinas, in harmony with the teaching of his time, wrote that it is necessary to baptize the children after their egress from the mother's womb. In the danger of death it is necessary to sprinkle water on the member that first becomes visible.

²⁷This variation of the baptismal rite is justified by the Roman theologians in this manner: "The rite of immersion was practised and taught from the apostles; we are obliged to avow it. But they so taught only as ecclesiastical lawgivers and not as promulgators of a divine commission. In other words the immersion is not a divine and apostolic tradition that the church must fulfill, but only an apostolic tradition that rightfully can be changed by the church," J. Bellamy, "Baptisme," in *Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique* t. II (Paris 1923, Edit. 3) c. 255. But where is the ground for this distinction between apostolical-Tradition and divine-Apostolical tradition? We do not find it in the Bible.

²⁸I Corblet (see Bibliography) t. I pg. 248f.

²⁹About the baptistries see: G. P. Kirsch, *Gli edifici cristiani nell'antichità. I battisterii*, in A. Fliche and V. Martin, *Storia della Chiesa*, Vol. III, Torino 1939, pp. 560-563; for the baptismal fonts: E. Lavagnino, *Fonti battesimali* in *Enciclopedia Italiana* vol. XV (1932), pp. 650f. The primitive fonts were a polygonal basin apt for immersion and infusion. The precedent baptistries were very bad with degrees for going down. The immersion was used in Florence about the year 1200 because the famous Italian poet Dante in his *Hell* (XIX, 16-21) says that he saved a man "that was drowning in the baptismal water." For the use of partial immersion with infusion in the first centuries see: C. F. Rogers, "Baptism and Christian Archæology" in *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, V, part iv; Lasus, *Sanctuaires Chrétiens de Syrie*, Paris 1947.

³⁰*Summa Theologica*, p. III, q. 66, a. 7 ad 3um.

If this is the head, the baptism is valid; if it is another member, the baptism is dubious. Therefore if the child lives, it is necessary to repeat with condition the administration of the baptism.³¹

4. The words of the baptismal formula

There were three principal questions about the words of baptism: (a) Is it necessary to say: "I baptize you"? (b) Is baptism made by the words "in the name of Jesus" valid? (c) Is it necessary to pronounce the words "in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit"?

(a) "*I baptize you*" (in Latin: *ego te baptizo*). The personal pronoun "I" (*ego*) is not necessary because it is already enclosed in the Latin verbal form "*baptizo*."³²

Albertus Magnus (1193-1280), ignoring the decision of pope Alexander III (1159-1181) edited only by the decretales of Gregory IX (1227-1241), taught that according to the opinion of many people the word "baptizo" (baptize), being enclosed in the baptismal act, is not necessary for the validity of the sacrament.³³ But when the sentence of the pope was known, the theologians unanimously asserted the necessity of this word for the validity of baptism.³⁴

It was common teaching that the words of baptism can be used validly also in the passive or deprecativ form: "This man *is baptized* in the name of the Father," etc., or "This man *be baptized* in the name of the Father," etc.³⁵

If the validity of baptism is dubious, it is necessary to repeat the baptism with the words: "If you are baptized I do not baptize you,

³¹Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* p. III, q. 68, a. 11 ad 4 um.

³²This reason is evident in the Latin conjugation where each person has its particular form: *baptizo*=I baptize, *baptizas*=you baptize, *baptizat*=he baptizes, *baptizamus*=we baptize, etc., Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* p. III, q. 66, a.5 ad lum.

³³In IV Sent. C.iv, dist. iii, a.2. But he prefers the opinion of its necessity: "Qusad institutionem ecclesiae dicunt multi quod verbum baptizo est de forma . . . sed ego puto verius quod est de forma secundum necessitatem."

³⁴We can read the sentence of Alexander III in D. N. 398: "*Si quis puerum ter in aqua immerserit in nomine Patris, et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, amen, et non dixerit: ego te baptizo . . . non est puer baptizatus.*" Only the agnostinian Francois Farvacques at Louvain denied, April 21, 1677, the necessity of the word "baptize." But Alexander VIII (1689-1691) took issue with this opinion that said: "Sometimes was valid the baptism done by this form: in the name of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Spirit without the words: I baptize you." Cf. L. Bachelet, *Alexandre VIII, Propositions condannees par Lui*, in *Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique* t. I (3 edition, Paris 1923) col. 760.

³⁵Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* p. III, q. 66, a.5 ad 2 um. This form was supposed as the baptismal form of the Grecian liturgy. "*Per modum graecorum*," said the theologians of the Middle Ages. This was also the decision of the Council of Florence in the *Decretum pro Armenis*, D. 696.

but if you are not baptized I baptize you," said pope Alexander III in the year 1159.³⁶

(b) "*In the name of Jesus Christ.*" Luke often speaks of a baptism made in the name of Jesus Christ (Acts 2:38; 19:5). The medieval theologians questioned the validity of the form "in the name of Jesus Christ." Fulgentius (d. 533), bishop of Ruspe, was doubtful and would not declare himself in favor or in opposition to the validity of this sentence.³⁷ The writer of the *De Trinitate*, perhaps Vigilius of Tapse, who lived about 484 at Cartago, taught that these words are sufficient for the validity of baptism because in the name of Jesus also the Father and the Holy Spirit are enclosed.³⁸ This opinion grounded itself upon a sentence of St. Ambrosius, bishop of Milan (d. 397), who so taught: "If you say Christ, you speak also of the Father that anointed him, of the Son that was anointed from him, and of the Holy Spirit by which Jesus was anointed."³⁹

The medieval theologians made a distinction between the apostolical age and the post-apostolical time. God, by special revelation, gave to the apostles the authority of baptizing in the name of Jesus: "because it was useful to exalt the name of Christ in that time, when it was spiteful to Jews and to heathen. This name was therefore made honorable because by its invocation the Holy Spirit was given."⁴⁰

But in the post-apostolical age baptism must be done in the name of the Trinity. Pope Gelasius, writing to the bishop Caudentius, taught that a man baptized only in the name of the Lord must be again baptized in the name of the Trinity.⁴¹ Only Caietan⁴² sustained the validity of baptism made in the name of Jesus also in the

³⁶"*De quibus dubium est an baptizati fuerint, baptizantur his verbis praemissis: Si baptizatus es, non te baptizo; sed si nondum baptizatus es, ego te baptizo.*"

³⁷*Contra Fabianum*, fragment 37, in Migne, *PL* 65, 830-832.

³⁸Pseudo-Athanasius, *De Trinitate*, lib. XII, in Migne, *PL* 62, 324, "*nam licet Filii nomen tantummodo dicatur, habet tamen Patrem et Spiritum Sanctum secum pronuntiatum.*"

³⁹*De Spiritu Sancto*, 1. 1 c. 3 Migne, *PL* 16, 742-743.

⁴⁰Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* p. III, q. 66, a. 6 ad 1^{um} "*ut nomen Christi quod erat odiosum Judaeis et Gentilibus honorabile redderetur per hoc quod ad ejus invocationem Spiritus Sanctus datur in baptismo.*" A Council of Fruil (year 791) taught that "it was made from the apostles by divine revelation, because all the holy Trinity is in it enclosed." Cf. Vacant, M., *Dictionnaire de Theologie*, Vol. II, col. 271, "Baptisme."

⁴¹"*Si hi de haereticis solummodo in nomine Domine baptizatos fuisse forsitan confitentur, sine cuiusquam dubitationis ambiguo eos ad catholicam fidem venientes sanctae Trinitatis nomine baptizabis.*" D. n. 229.

⁴²Thomas de Vio, surnamed Caietan⁴² (1485-1533) was a philosopher and a theologian of the Dominican friars.

post-apostolical time. But, as wrote Cardinal Billot, his sentence was expelled by order of pope Pius V in the Roman printing of his writing.⁴³ This opinion was, however, formerly asserted by pope Stephen in an epistle to Cyprian where it is written: "Every person that everywhere is baptized in the name of Christ receives at once the Christ's grace."⁴⁴ The same sentence was maintained from the pope Nicholas I (858-867) in an epistle sent to the Bulgarians: "(Baptism administered by a Jew) is valid if it was made in the name of the Trinity or at least in the name of Christ (That is the same as Ambrose wrote) as we read in the Acts of the Apostles. Therefore they shall not be baptized."⁴⁵

None of the theologians noticed that in the Greek text of the New Testament two different constructions are here used. The sentence "in the name of Jesus" is constructed by the particle *en* (*en onomati*) and signifies that baptism is made by the authority—the power—of the person (name = person) of Jesus. Therefore it is distinct from the baptism of John or of the Jews. The sentence "in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" is constructed by the particle *eis* (*eis to anoma*) that we find also in Acts 2:38 ("for the remission of sins"). It teaches therefore that baptism brings the baptized man in contact with the essence (name = essence, person) of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.⁴⁶

(c) *The invocation of the Trinity.* The theologians of the Middle Ages usually said that it was necessary for the validity of baptism to invoke the Trinity. The Church cannot change what was appointed by Jesus himself. This teaching is in harmony with precedent declarations.⁴⁷ Pope Zacharias (741-752) taught thus: "Everybody baptized without invocation of the Holy Trinity does not re-

⁴³L. Billot, *De Ecclesiae sacramentis*, Roma 1896, Vol. I, p. 211f.

⁴⁴D. n. 47. *Fragment ep. ad. Cyprianum*. It is referred to in epistle 74 to Cyprian, sent from Firmilian.

⁴⁵*Responsa Nicolai ad Bulgaros* c. 104 D. n. 335: "*hi profecto, si in nomine Sanctae Trinitatis vel tantum in nomine Christi, sicut in Actibus Apostolorum legimus, sunt (unum quippe idemque est, ut sanctus exponit Ambrosius) constat eos non esse denuo baptizandos.*" The theologians of Rome say, of course, that this erroneous sentence of the pope is a personal opinion that consequently is not infallible.

⁴⁶Compare this writer's article on this point in a Christian magazine. F. Salvoni, *Battezzandoli nel nome del Padre, del Figlio e dello Spirito Santo* in "*Il seme del Regno*" 4 (Rome 1957), 70-75.

⁴⁷Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* p. III q. 66, a. 6, "*si prae-termittatur aliquid eorum, quae Christus instituit circa aliquot sacramentum, efficacia caret . . . Christus autem instituit, sacramentum baptismi dari cum invocatione Trinitatis.*" Formerly this was sustained by Fulgentius, Epistle VIII n. 19 Migne *PL* 65, 369; Ildephonse of Toledo, *Liber in cognitione baptismi unus* c. CXVII, Migne *PL* 96, 159-60.

ceive the sacrament of regeneration . . . baptism is perfected only when a person is baptized in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit . . . and is plunged into water according to the will of the Lord."⁴⁸ Alcuin of York wrote that it is useless to repeat the form of the Trinity three times in harmony with the three immersions, because it is sufficient to pronounce it a lone time.⁴⁹

II. The Subjects of Baptism

With the diffusion of the belief in original sin baptism of children became more and more common. This custom influenced also the baptism of grown-up people and reduced more and more their personal activity.

1. The baptism of children

Walafrid Strabo, renowned master and abbot of Reichenau (d. 849), was the lone theologian who asserted that children were not baptized in the first two centuries.⁵⁰ The other theologians, as Peter the Venerable (1094-1156), acknowledge that the practice of baptizing children became common only in the 5th or at least in the 7th century. The validity of this baptism is sustained by historical grounds. The church from 500 A. D. wrote Peter the Venerable, or at least from 300 A. D. baptized all the children. If this baptism is not valid now, the church of Christ is no longer in existence because the priests are no priests, baptism being necessary for the validity of their ordination. He claims that the faith asserted as necessary from the Bible is not in opposition to this custom, because it is supplied by the faith of the Church. As the children are condemned in Adam without personal sin, in the same manner they are saved in Jesus without the use of their free will.⁵¹ As the children in the mother's womb receive their nourishment from the mother without

⁴⁸Epistle 10, resp. 11 "*Sacris liminibus ad Bonifacium archiepiscopum*" May 748 in D. n. 297. "*Si mersus fuit sine invocatione Trinitatis, perfectus non est (baptisma), nisi fuerit in nomine Patris, et Filii et Spiritus Sancti baptizatus.*" The same sentence was uttered from the IV council of Lateran in the year 1215 (D 413), in the Council of Vienne (XV oecumenical) of the year 1312 (D. 482), in the XVII oecumenical Council of Florence November 22, 1439 (D. 696).

⁴⁹Alcuinus (originally Alchoin, Alcwin, or Alchuine, that is Ealthe wine "friend of the Temple") lived in the years 735-804. So he writes in his Epistle CXIII *Ad Paulinum Patriarcham* (in the year 800) "*quid opus est tertio replicare quod semel dictum sufficit?*" Migne, PL 100, 542.

⁵⁰*De ecclesiasticis rebus* c. XXVI, Migne, PL 114, 957-961.

⁵¹Peter the Venerable, *Tractatus contra Petrobrusianos*, Migne PL 189, 729-762.

personal activity, in the same manner they receive gratuitously the salvation in the motherly womb of the Church.⁵²

This belief was officially asserted in the Council of Arras (1025) where Gerardus, bishop of Cambrai, affirmed the validity of baptism of children denied by the disciples of the heretic Gerardus.⁵³ Pope Innocent III (1198-1216) forced the Waldenses to make this profession of faith when they came back to Catholicism: "We acknowledge also the baptism of children and avow that they, dying without personal sins, can reach salvation."⁵⁴ Also the IV Council of Lateran (oecumenical XII) allowed the validity of children's baptism.⁵⁵

2. Baptism of Grown People.

The medieval theologians asserted that for the baptism of adult persons three elements are necessary: (a) the intention of receiving the baptism, (b) repentance and (c) faith. But these personal elements require a little activity from the baptized people.

a) *The Intention.* The person that wishes to be baptized must have the intention of being baptized; otherwise the sacrament is not valid. Innocent III (1198-1216) asserted that the foolish people that were ever foolish can be baptized, because they are as children. But the sleeping persons and the foolish people that before were not foolish cannot be baptized if they before did not have the intention of receiving the baptism. But if they had this intention, then they can be baptized.⁵⁶ Entirely different is the teaching of the Bible that requires a personal and actual participation in the burial and the resurrection of the baptized people symbolized in the immersion into water (Rom. 6:4).

⁵²Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* p. III, q. 68, a. 9 ad 1 um "pueri nondum habentes usum rationis, quasi in utero matris Ecclesiae salutem suscipiunt."

⁵³Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles* IV, I & 533 (Paris 1907). The validity of children's baptism was first asserted in the Council of Carthage and approved by pope Zosimus (417-418): D. 102.

⁵⁴D. 424: "approbamus ergo baptismum infantium qui si defuncti fuerint post baptismum, antequam peccata committent, fatemur eos salvare et credimus."

⁵⁵"Sacramentum baptismi . . . tam pervulis quam adultis . . . proficit ad salutem" D. 430.

⁵⁶"Dormientes autem et amentes, si prius quam amentiam incurrerent aut dormirent, in contradictione persisterent: quia in eis intelligitur contradictionis propositum perdurare, etsi fuerint sic immersi, characterem non suscipiunt sacramenti. Secus autem si prius cathecumeni exstitissent et habuissent propositum baptizandi, unde tales in necessitatis articulo consuevit Ecclesia baptizare. Tunc ergo characterem sacramentalis imprimit operatio." D. 411. See also Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, p. III, q. 67, a.12; q. 68, a.7.

b) *Repentance*. Its necessity is asserted from Thomas Aquinas, who calls it "a confession made before God" (*confessio peccatorum quae fit Deo*). By repentance the person that wishes to be baptized "thinks of his sins and mourns for them" (*sua peccata recogitans de eis doleat*).⁵⁷ Without repentance the baptized person does not receive the remission of sins but only the sacramental character. The forgiveness of sin will come in the future when he changes his mind about his sins and regrets them.⁵⁸

c) *Faith*. The necessity of faith is openly asserted from the Bible (Rom. 9-10; Heb. 11:6, etc.). But the theologians of Rome taught that without faith the baptism is equally valid if the person will receive the sacrament. In this chance baptism gives the character, but it does not give the forgiveness of sins. The remission of these will come in the future by the acquisition of the true faith by the baptized person.⁵⁹

This teaching about repentance and faith is in opposition to the Bible, which openly requires the actual faith and repentance. The word of God ignores the distinction between the character and the forgiveness of sins. Where baptism is, there is also the remission of sins. Where it is the true baptism, there simultaneously the baptized man is put into Christ (Gal. 3:27) and is a son of God (Gal. 3:26). But the theologians of the Middle Ages did not inquire about this contradiction.

3. When must baptism be administered?

From the 5th or 7th century baptism was given to children, as we saw above.⁶⁰ The former practice of baptizing persons only on the two eves of Passover and Pentecost was lost in the 13th century notwithstanding the opposition of some bishops. The synods of the 14th and 15th centuries taught only that Christian people must baptize children as soon as possible.⁶¹ In this manner the church came back to the Bible, which does not fix times for the administration of baptism. But on the contrary, the Roman church baptizes children as

⁵⁷*Ibid.*, p. III, q. 67, a.6.

⁵⁸*Ibid.*, p. III, q. 69, a.9 and 10.

⁵⁹Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, p. III, q. 68, a.8: "*Recta fides baptizati non requiritur ex necessitate ad baptismum, sicut nec recta fides baptizantis, dummodo adsint caetera quae sunt de necessitate sacramenti; non enim sacramentum perficitur per iustitiam hominis dentis vel suscipientis baptismum, sed per virtutem Dei.*"

⁶⁰See Note 51.

⁶¹For example, in the Decret to the Jacobites (*ex Bulla: Cantate Domino*, February 4, 1441): "*Circa pueros . . . non esse per quadraginta aut octoginta dies seu aliud tempus iuxta quorundam observantiam sacrum baptismum differendum, sed quamprimum commode fieri potest, debet conferri.*" D. 712.

soon as they are born "of the blood and of the will of the flesh" (John 1:13) whilst the Bible teaches that every person must be baptized as soon as he reaches the true faith.

III. The Administrator of Baptism

1. *The bishop and the priests.* In the time of Ildephonse (617-667), archbishop of Toledo, only the bishop with the assistance of the priests and of the deacons could baptize.⁶² Afterward with the parochial districts made in the age of Charles the Great⁶³ also the parish priest received the authority of baptizing. The other priests and the deacons are ordinarily the ministers of baptism, but they must receive before a special permission from the bishop or the parish priest. Naturally this permission is required only for the license (that is, the right of administration of baptism without personal sin of disobedience to the Church), not for the validity.⁶⁴

2. *The lay persons.* The minister of baptism in an emergency can be a layman or a woman. Also a heretic or a pagan can perform baptism if he intends to perform what the church teaches about baptism. But at the time of Charles the Great some theologians asserted that baptism performed by a layman is not valid.⁶⁵ But afterward the opinion of the Council of Compiègne (year 738), which was in harmony with pope Sergius' teaching, concerning the validity of baptism performed by laymen⁶⁶ prevailed and became common.

Pope Urban II taught in the year 1094 that everybody, man or woman, in an emergency can perform baptism. The same sentence

⁶²*Liber in cognitione baptismi unus.* c. CXVI, PL 96.

⁶³Cmp. H. Leclercq, *Paroisses rurales*, in *Dictionnaire d'Archeologie Chretienne* (Paris 1937) XIII, 2198-2235; P. Imbart de la Tour, *Les paroisses rurales dans l'ancienne France du VI au XI siecles*, Paris 1900.

⁶⁴Theodulphe, bishop of Orleans, in his *Capitula ad presbyteros* 17 in Migne PL 105 ,196 (for the priests); Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* p. III, q. 67, a. L (for the deacons).

⁶⁵*Capitularia* in Migne, PL 97, 760: "*Si quis presbyter ordinatus deprehenderit se non esse baptizatum, baptizetur et ordinetur iterum, et omnes quos prius baptizavit*" (If an ordained priest knows that he was not baptized, he must be baptized and ordained. Also all persons that he baptized must be again baptized.) Migne, PL 97, 849: "*Praecipimus ut qui a paganis baptizati sunt, denuo a Christi sacerdotibus in nomine sanctae Trinitatis baptizentur . . . quia aliter Christiani nec dici nec esse possunt.*" (A person baptized by a pagan must again be baptized by a Christian priest; otherwise he cannot be considered a Christian and cannot be a Christian.)

⁶⁶Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, Vol. III, 2 (Paris 1910) p. 942, can. 12.

was uttered by the Council of Florence (oecumenical XVII) in the year 1441.⁶⁷

Nobody can baptize himself, as answered pope Innocent III (1198-1216), about a Jew who plunged himself into water saying: "I baptize myself in the name of Father, etc." This baptism must be repeated, said the pope.⁶⁸

IV. The Design of Baptism

The medieval theologians and councils, in harmony with the Bible, taught that baptism has a negative effect (that is, the forgiveness of sins) and a positive (that is, the regeneration or the birth of the new nature).

a) *The forgiveness of sins.* Baptism gives the remission of all prebaptismal sin both original and actual. This was the opinion of Aurelius Augustine.⁶⁹ Innocent III (1198-1216) taught that "there are two kinds of sins: original and actual. The original is the sin that we contract without the consent of the will; the actual is the sin that we commit with the consent of the will. Therefore the original sin, contracted without personal consent, is removed by baptism without our consent (The children cannot consent to baptism!); but actual sin (that is, committed with personal consent) is remitted only with the consent of the will."⁷⁰ The same sentence was asserted by the council of Florence, (oecumenical XVII, Year 1439). In the *Decretum pro Armenis* it asserted that baptism "gives forgiveness both original and actual, and of every punishment, that we are culpable of."⁷¹ As Gregory the Great (590-604) taught, the original sin that in the ancient law was forgiven by faith, sacrifices, and circumcision, now can be removed only by baptism, or by martyrdom, which is a perfect form of baptism."⁷²

⁶⁷"*Minister hujus sacramenti (baptismi) est sacerdos, cui competit ex officio baptizare. In casu autem necessitatis, non solum sacerdos et diaconus, sed etiam laicus vel mulier, immo etiam paganus et haereticus baptizare potest, forman servet Ecclesiae, et facere intendat quod facit Ecclesia*" "The minister of this sacrament of baptism is the priest, who is obliged to perform the sacrament. In an emergency not the priest or the deacon alone can perform the sacrament, but too the layman and the woman, even a pagan, or an heretic, can perform the baptism, if these follow the form asserted by the Church and will do what the church is doing." D. 696.

⁶⁸D. 413.

⁶⁹*De peccatorum merito et remissione* II, 28 n. 48; 1, 9 n. 10.

⁷⁰*Peccatum est duplex: originale, scilicet et actuale: originale, quod absque consensu contrahitur, et actuale, quod committitur cum consensu. Originale igitur, quod sine consensu contrahitur, sine consensu per vim remittitur sacramenti; actuale verro, quod cum consensu contrahitur, sine consensu minime relaxatur."*

⁷¹D. 696 "*huius sacramenti effectus est remission omnis culpae originalis et actualis, omnis quoque poenae, quae pro ipsa culpa debetur.*"

⁷²*Moralia*, 1. IV, c. 111, Migne PL 15, 635 Maximus of Turin (bishop cir. 380), Sermo 88, Migne, PL 57, 708f.

b) *The positive design of baptism.* The theologians spoke more and more about the infusion of grace given by baptism, but they did not study with accuracy the infusion of the Holy Spirit of which on the contrary the Bible speaks often (e. g. Acts 2:38). They spoke about the character given by this sacrament.

(1) *Grace.* It is this quality which makes us sons of God. Grace is a quality inherent to the soul that gives to men the possibility of participating in the divine nature of God. "The baptized persons are incorporated into Christ, and from this head they gain as his bodily members the fulness of his grace and virtues."⁷³ This grace can be wanting when the baptized person brings an obstacle, such as the failure of faith or an affection for sin. When this obstacle is removed, then grace is given.⁷⁴

(2) *Character.* Baptism always gives the character that is the participation in the Christ, by which the baptized is made a Christian and gains the possibility of receiving the other sacraments.⁷⁵

Nothing was taught by the theologians of the Middle Ages about the incorporation of the child into the family of God by baptism. Baptism is considered a personal affair without the social responsibilities spoken of in the Bible.

For its effects baptism is absolutely necessary and can be substituted only by martyrdom (the baptism of blood) and the desire or the love of God (the baptism of desire).⁷⁶

The medieval teaching of baptism remains unchanged today in the Roman Church.⁷⁷ The decisions of the councils and the doctrine of the theologians, not the Bible, are now the fundament of the Roman Catholic Theology.

Milano, Italy.

⁷³Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, p. III, q. 69, a. 4.

⁷⁴*Ibid*, II, 2.

⁷⁵About baptismal character see the *Decretum pro Armenis*: "(The character) is a gate of spiritual life" (D.n. 695 f). For the Council of Trent "It is a spiritual and ineffaceable sign of the soul" (Session VII, Can 9; D. n. 852).

⁷⁶These two baptisms are asserted by the council of Trent (Session VI, 4. D. 796) and are grounded on Luke 9:24; Mt. 10:39; John 12:25 (baptism of blood) and on John 14:21 (baptism of desire).

⁷⁷Now the theologians question only the position of children dead without baptism. In the past the theologians (as Thomas Aquinas, II Sententiarum, dist. 3, q. 11, a. 2) taught that these were condemned to the limb, but now the theologians of Rome understand that this third condition between heaven and hell is absolutely unbiblical. Therefore some theologians teach now that also these children by special divine intervention will equally be saved. A. Michel, *Salut des enfants morts sans baptême*, in "Ami du clerge" 58 (1948) 33-34; the same, *Encore le sort des enfants morts sans baptême*, *Ibid.*, 61 (1951) 97-101.

SOME IMPORTANT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- J. Bellamy, *Baptême dans l'église latine depuis le VIII^e siècle*, in Vacant Mangenot, *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, 12 (Paris 1923) coll. 250-296.
- I. Corblet, *Histoire dogmatique, liturgique et archéologique du sacrement du baptême*, Paris 1881, Vol. 2.
- Denzinger-Bannwart, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, edit. 7, Friburg in Brissgau 1928; sign D.
- F. de Saint-Andeol, *Etudes sur les baptistères*, les piscines et les cuves pour l'intelligence de l'administration du baptême depuis les premiers siècles de l'Eglise jusqu'à nos jours, in "Revue de l'art chrétien," 9 (1865) 561-593; 10 (1866) 30-45; 73-94.
- F. X. Funk, *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen I* (Paderborn 1897) 478-483. See this work about the origin of the actual baptismal form.
- Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, Paris 1907-1938 (Vol. 10).
- Migne: *PL* is the well-known *Patrologiae cursus completus*. *PL* is the *Patrologia Latina*, that is, *Latin Patrology*.
- C. F. Rogers, "Baptism and christian archeologie," in *Studia Ecclesiastica*, Oxford 1903, t. V, p. 239-362.
- Wall, *History of Infant Baptism*, London, 1900.

Baptism in the Early Restoration Movement

Carl Spain

There have been many efforts to set forth in order a declaration of historical developments in the course of church history which explain the place of baptism in the doctrinal emphasis of the Restoration movement in America. There has been an intense interest in determining just when and with whom certain aspects of the doctrine of baptism had their beginning and a desire to give credit to whom credit is due. It is evident that all aspects of the whole truth on this subject were not discovered by any particular individual at any certain point in history.

Some church historians trace the thinking of the Restoration leaders on the subject and character of Baptism back to the influence of the Scotch Baptist, who filtered into Ireland early in the nineteenth century teaching and practicing immersion for the remission of sins. H. C. Armstrong lists six primary ideas which he considers the most important ones that the Disciples inherited from the Scotch Baptist, one of which concerned the "subject and character of baptism."¹ Concerning the influence of the Scotch Baptist in Ireland, and especially with reference to Thomas Campbell, he emphasizes that the Disciples are indebted to the Scotch Baptist for the meaning rather than the form of Baptism.

This Scotch Baptist activity in the north of Ireland leads straight to that eventful meeting in the house of Thomas Acheson in western Pennsylvania in which Thomas Campbell announced that notable rule which has been the watchword of the Disciples.²

According to Armstrong, the presence of James Foster in the home of Acheson and the controversy that took place on that occasion between Andrew Munro, Thomas Acheson and James Foster is the link between the Scotch Baptist of Ireland and Campbell's increasing awareness of the scriptural meaning of baptism. Agitated by Campbell's statement of the rule, "Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; and where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent," Munro replied: "Mr. Campbell, if we adopt that as a basis, then there is an end of infant baptism." Visibly disturbed, Mr. Acheson exclaimed: "I hope I may never see the day when my heart will renounce that blessed saying of the Scripture, 'Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven'." In answer to Acheson, James Foster reminded him that the portion of Scripture he had quoted contained no reference to infant baptism.

¹H. C. Armstrong, "Disciples and Scotch Baptist," *The Shane Quarterly*, Volume 2, Numbers 2-3, (April-July, 1941), p. 360.

²*Ibid.*, p. 358.

With reference to the Scotch Baptist influence, Armstrong makes this observation concerning the presence of James Foster in Pennsylvania:

Who was James Foster? He was precentor and a member of the Independent congregation of Rich Hill, Ireland, neighbor and friend of the Campbells, persuaded by them to come to America. . . James Foster was one of the organizers of the Christian Association and one of the first deacons of the Brush Run Church. His place and influence in the first days of the Disciples' movement is large and lasting. He and his work are part of the Scotch Baptist inheritance.³

The sojourn of Alexander Campbell in Glasgow, Scotland is also significant with reference to Scotch Baptist influence, and helps to explain why Robert Richardson referred to the Scotch Baptist movement as the first phase of the religious reformation which we call the Restoration movement. As to the effect of the Glasgow visit on Alexander Campbell's thinking on baptism, Jesse R. Kellems says: "The sojourn in Scotland contributed nothing to the change which was afterwards so marked and influential in all his work.⁴ Mr. Kellems points out the fact that Campbell himself manifested an "indifference to the whole vexing question of baptism during his sojourn in Scotland." Robert Richardson, whose witness is most valuable to the historian, evaluates Campbell's visit to Glasgow and its effects on his thinking concerning the mode and design of baptism, stating that "none of the questions connected with infant baptism and immersion, which had . . . thus caused so many divisions in Scotland, and in regard to which Mr. Campbell became afterward so distinguished, engaged, at this time, his attention in the least."⁵

Many of the Scotch Baptists were anti-immersionists. Greville Ewing was one of this group. Others earnestly contended for immersion, among whom were the Haldanes. The baptismal controversy ultimately caused a schism in the Haldane congregation in Glasgow. Campbell's indifference on the question at this time is attributed to his desire to avoid unpleasant confusion in his relationship with good friends on both sides of the controversy. It did not become his personal problem until his first child was born in March 13, 1812. It was at this time that he was forced to reach a conviction on the question of infant baptism and the scriptural form of baptism. His thinking on the scriptural design of baptism began to take shape in his debate with Walker in 1820, but it was not until he debated McCalla in 1823 that he came to a full understanding on the meaning and purpose of the ordinance.

Some historians see the influence of the Scotch Baptist in the

³*Ibid.*, p. 359.

⁴Jesse R. Kellems, *Alexander Campbell and the Disciples*, (New York, N. Y., Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1930) p. 246.

⁵Robert Richardson, *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, Vol. I, (Cincinnati, Ohio: The Standard Press, . . .), pp. 186-87.

thinking of Walter Scott who is generally regarded as one of the restoration movement's most celebrated leaders, along with the Campbells and Barton W. Stone. After his arrival in America from Greenock in 1818, Scott began to develop an interest in the subject of baptism as a result of his study of the Bible. "A tract on the subject came suddenly into his hands from a Scotch Baptist Church in New York City. Scott was impressed, so much so that he left Pittsburgh for New York to study the matter further. But he was disappointed."⁶ With his mind still unsettled he continued to study his Bible. In the winter of 1821-22, while teaching in Pittsburgh, he met Alexander Campbell for the first time. To their mutual surprise they found that their religious views were very much alike. They were both engaged in prayerful study of the scriptures in an effort to find the truth on the doctrine of baptism. Both had reached the conclusion that scriptural baptism was connected with "the remission of sins."

The progress of Alexander Campbell's thinking on baptism may be briefly set forth as follows:

(1) His first real interest in the question was provoked by his reading the proof sheets of his father's "Declaration and Address" in October of 1809. This led to discussions with Doctor Riddle of the Presbyterian Union Church, who insisted that allegiance to Thomas Campbell's position would require that he become a Baptist or immersionist. Doctor Riddle also added by way of emphasis that there was not one express precept for, nor precedent of, infant baptism in the Scriptures. Thus excited, Alexander turned to Andrew Munro, who was present, for help in securing books on the subject. He then plunged into an earnest study of the Scriptures in the original language in a search for the truth.⁷

(2) The birth of his first child, a daughter, on March 13, 1812 forced Campbell to reach a conclusion on infant baptism and immersion. With the help of Munro he continued to study available materials on the subject.⁸ He became convinced that the only valid Apostolic or Christian baptism was the immersion of a penitent believer. For the series of events that followed, we turn to Campbell's own words which tell of his experience with Matthias Luse:

Immediately I went in quest of an administrator, of one who practised what he preached. I spent the next evening with Elder Luse. Having on a former occasion, heard him preach, but not on that subject, I asked him into what formula of faith he immersed. His answer was that "the Baptist church required candidates to appear before it, and on a narration of their experience, approved by the church, a time and place were appointed for the baptism."

⁶Earl Irvin West, *The Search for the Ancient Order* (Nashville, Tenn., The Gospel Advocate Co., 1949) p. 81.

⁷Kellems, *op. cit.*, pp. 248-49.

⁸West, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

To this I immediately demurred, saying:—That I knew no scriptural authority for bringing a candidate for baptism before the church to be examined, judged, and approved, by it, as a prerequisite to his baptism. To which he simply responded:—"It was the Baptist custom." "But was it," said I, "the apostolic custom?" He did not contend that it was, admitting freely that such was not the case from the beginning. "But," said he, "If I were to depart from my usual custom, they might hold me to account before the Association." "Sir," I replied, "there is but one confession of faith that I can make, and into that alone can I consent to be baptized." "What is that?" said he. "Into the belief that Jesus is the one Christ, the confession into which the first converts were immersed. I have set out to follow the apostles of Christ and their master, and I will be baptized only into the primitive Christian faith."⁹

Matthias Luse agreed to do the baptizing. He, with Elder Henry Spears, met Campbell at Buffalo Creek near his home and where he was accustomed to preach. On June 12, 1812, before a large and interested congregation, Campbell and six other adults, including his father, mother, eldest sister and his wife, were baptized. Twenty others were baptized the next Lord's day, and shortly the number reached one hundred of that community.

(3) The next significant event in the progress of Campbell's thinking was his debate with Mr. John Walker, a minister of the Secession. Since the debate involved the question of infant baptism, the doctrine of circumcision was introduced by Mr. Walker in an effort to justify infant baptism. Campbell presented seven respects in which baptism differs from circumcision. "In the seventh place," he said, "Baptism differs from circumcision in the blessings it conveys . . . Baptism is connected with the promise of the remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit."¹⁰

It is interesting to note that Mr. Walker, in his effort to prove infant baptism, introduced the idea of remission of sins as he argued that sprinkling or pouring fulfilled the true meaning of baptism:

Again, the meaning of the ordinance of Baptism, as explained in many passages, fully shews that this is the true meaning of the word—thus "be baptized for the remission of sins, be baptized and wash away your sins, the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin, but ye are washed, but ye are justified"; now how is this washing performed, "by the blood of sprinkling"—"your hearts are sprinkled from a guilty conscience." So that the meaning of the word, and the meaning of the ordinance, concur in establishing the point that sprinkling is the true mode of baptism. I know Mr. Campbell is anxious to get at this huge pile of Greek—you will no doubt be much entertained with it—he may now proceed.¹¹

Later in the debate Mr. Walker reminded Campbell that he had re-

⁹*The Millennial Harbinger*, Volume for 1848, pp. 280-83.

¹⁰*Campbell-Walker Debate*, p. 13.

¹¹*Ibid.*, p. 123.

plied to the above position. Campbell's answer was to this effect:

"I deny that baptism has a respect to the blood of sprinkling, but that it denotes the "washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, and is emblematical of the burial and resurrection of Christ, and of our death and burial with him unto sin and of our resurrection with him to a new life." He then quotes Romans 6:4-6, Colossians 2:12 and I Peter 3:21.¹²

(4) Campbell's debate with W. L. McCalla, a Presbyterian preacher from Kentucky, came as the direct result of a challenge he issued at the conclusion of the Walker debate. The challenge was accepted in May, 1823 and took place the following October. In the discussion on infant baptism, Campbell made the argument that baptism was for the remission of sins, and therefore could not concern infants since they knew no sin.

In this discussion he distinguished between "real" and "formal" remission of sins. By way of clarification he says:

The blood of Christ, then, really cleanses us who believe from all sin. Behold the goodness of God in giving us a formal proof and token of it, by ordaining a baptism expressly "for the remission of sins." The water of baptism, then, formally washes away our sins. The blood of Christ really washes away our sins. Paul's sins really were pardoned when he believed, yet he had no solemn pledge of the fact, no formal acquittal, no formal purgation of his sins, until he washes them away in the water of baptism. To every believer, therefore, baptism is a formal and personal remission, or purgation of sins. The believer never has his sins formally washed away or remitted until he is baptized.¹³

(5) Following the McCalla debate Campbell began the publication of the *Christian Baptist*, in which there is much evidence that his ideas concerning the design of baptism were fast reaching full maturity. During this time, he came under the influence of the dynamic personality of Walter Scott, which, as Kellems points out, was perhaps just at this time, the most powerful force in the finalizing of Campbell's idea of baptismal design.

The religious movement led by Barton W. Stone is very significant in the history of the doctrine of baptism in the Restoration movement. Following the meeting of the Synod of Kentucky in September of 1803, Stone made his break with Presbyterianism because of his "Arminian" views. He gave himself seriously to the study of the question of baptism. Under the influence of Robert Marshall he became convinced that pedobaptism was wrong and that immersion was the scriptural form. He and Marshall baptized each other. After this he continued his study of the subject and even dared to stand up during a great revival to speak his convictions on Acts 2:38. He was rather intimidated by the severe opposition which he

¹²*Ibid.*, pp. 136-137.

¹³*Campbell-McCalla Debate*, p. 135.

¹⁴Kellems, *op. cit.*, p. 259.

faced from other religious groups, and his mind continued in a rather unsettled state for a number of years. During a meeting at Millersburg, Kentucky in 1821, he became very disturbed because the "mourners" who came found no relief in spite of their earnest penitence. He stood before the audience and said:

Brethren, something must be wrong; We have been laboring with these mourners earnestly, and they are deeply penitent; why have they not found relief? We all know that God is willing to pardon them, and certainly they are anxious to receive it. The cause must be that we do not preach as the apostles did. On the Day of Pentecost those who were "pierced to the heart" were promptly told what to do for the remission of sins, And "they gladly received the word and were baptized; and the same day about three thousand more were added unto them."¹⁵

Samuel Rogers, outstanding in restoration history, who was present at this meeting confessed that he thought Stone was beside himself at the time.

Stone was not alone in his search for the truth on this question. One of the men he had ordained, B. F. Hall, was also disturbed. In a little cabin on Line Creek which divides Kentucky and Tennessee, Hall found a copy of the Campbell-McCalla debate. Campbell's speech on the design of baptism was the thing that settled his mind. Later he spoke to Stone about it and Stone replied that he himself had been preaching such, but had not pressed the matter because it seemed to displease his audiences and have a chilling effect upon them.

Stone and Campbell first met each other at Georgetown, Kentucky in the year 1824. Their convictions compared so favorably that a mutually rewarding fellowship followed which led ultimately to the union of two movements. The Stone movement had insisted on the name Christian to the exclusion of all others. Campbell's movement was identified as the Reformed Baptist. Existing side by side in various Kentucky communities they gradually reached agreement. On April 24, 1831 the groups united in one fellowship which was destined to grow in spiritual and numerical strength.

In our efforts to decide just how and to what extent certain movements and men influenced other movements and men in their thinking on baptism, there is the danger that we shall underestimate the powerful impact of the scriptures on individuals who, confused by doctrinal chaos, turned to their Bibles in prayerful and studious solitude. Whatever the influence of the Scotch Baptist may have been on their thinking, we must not forget that men like Campbell and Scott and Stone did not receive the truth on baptism from men, but it came to them by diligent study of the revelation of Jesus Christ as set forth by him in his New Testament. This is not intended to depreciate nor minimize the provocative value of historical connections and influences in shaping a man's attitude and beliefs on cer-

¹⁵West, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

tain doctrinal questions, but rather to remind us of the sovereign role of Christ and the all-sufficiency of the Scriptures in matters of doctrine, of reproof, of correction and instruction in righteousness (II Timothy 3:16). There have been at different points in history in different parts of the world restoration movements unrelated to each other except by a common respect for the Bible as the authoritative expression of Christian doctrine, and a desperate desire to know the truth. Individuals thus motivated to study the Bible may meet other individuals who have been studying the Bible with singleness of heart and discover to their joyful surprise that they believe the same thing. The seed of the kingdom has often fallen into the heart of a man simply because a Bible fell into his hands. If his personality is unique and dynamic it is possible that he may become an instrument in God's hands in the beginning of a separate and distinct reformation and restoration movement. It may prove to be closely kin to another movement because each has sprung from the same dynamic seed, the Word of God, which fell into the rich, deep soil on an honest and good heart.

PERSONALIA (Con't from page 171)

Fausto Salvoni of Milano, Italy, received the best education of his native country, earning the D.D. and Doctor of Theology degrees. He taught in leading Catholic Universities in Italy before his conversion by Cline Paden in 1951. Frequent contributor to such journals as *Scuola*, *Aegyptus*, *Humanitas*, *Catholica* and *Protestantismo*. He is the author of a number of books and has held a number of debates. He is at present kept busy preaching in Italy and other European countries.

Carl Spain is minister of the Graham Street Church in Abilene, Texas. He holds the M.A. and B.D. degrees from SMU. He is Assoc. Prof. of Bible at ACC and is working toward the Th.D. degree at Southwestern Theological Seminary at Ft. Worth.

Frank Pack is Prof. of Bible and Religious Ed. at ACC and minister of the Northside church in Abilene. He has the B.A. from Chattanooga U., the M.A. from Vanderbilt, and the Ph.D. from Southern Calif.

J. W. Roberts is Assoc. Prof. of Bible and Greek at ACC. He has the B.A. from ACC, the M.A. from Wichita U. and the Ph.D. from Texas U.

Dieter Alten is an evangelist for the churches in Germany. In addition to his education in his native country, he attended David Lipscomb College at Nashville, Tennessee.

Callie Faye Milliken is Asst. Prof. and head librarian at ACC. She holds the B.A. degree from ACC and the M.A. from Texas U.

Some Modern Views on Infant Baptism

Frank Pack

A little more than fifty years ago, the Anglican scholar and bishop, B. F. Westcott, predicted that the next great theological controversy would arise in the religious world over baptism and its meaning. At that time such a thing seemed very remote from the thinking of a Protestant world dominated by "liberal" theology, and yet, the years have proved Westcott correct. With the rising interest in the Bible and its message as a reaction to the "liberalism" of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, there has also come a new regard for the teaching of the Bible on baptism and its meaning, and the serious questioning on the part of many of various practices connected with baptism in the religious world. In this brief paper, it shall be our purpose to outline only a few of the important lines of thinking in this revival of interest in baptism.

The "liberal" attitude toward baptism has been in great contrast to the Bible's teaching on this theme. A very vague view of its meaning and importance has characterized theologians of this persuasion. In many cases their attitude has amounted to a view that this would be a nice thing to do. In regard to infants the view was that it did not particularly matter whether they were baptized or not since there was no belief in the older doctrine of "original sin." Infant baptism virtually became, for "liberal" Protestants, a matter of dedication of the baby to God. With regard to the mode, whether complete immersion, or other modes, the question was regarded as completely unimportant, for the general respect for the Bible's teaching on any doctrinal matter was not very high. Only with the revival of interest in the Bible by modern theology have questions of serious import for baptism come again to the attention of the religious world.

One of the smaller controversies regarding baptism has related to the mode. Adolf Harnack took the position that among early Christians the mode had no connection with the validity of baptism. He with other scholars seemed to have based this position on the statement made in the *Didache*, or *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, a rather early non-canonical work, giving directions for baptism. The passage follows: "And concerning baptism, thus baptize ye: Having first said all these things, baptize into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, in living water. But if thou have not living water, baptize in other water; and if thou canst not in cold, in warm. But if thou have not either, pour out water thrice upon the head into the name of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit. But before the baptism let the baptizer fast, and the baptized, and whatever others can; but thou shalt order the baptized to fast one

or two days before.”¹ In arguing on this same point, Lindsay in the *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* comments,

This seems to say that to baptize by immersion was the practice recommended for general use, but that the mode of affusion was also valid and enjoined on occasion. What is here prescribed in the *Didache* seems to have been the practice usually followed in the early cents. of the Christian church.²

More recently the same position is stated in *Religion in Life*, in an article by Elmer S. Freeman.³

However, one need only note the complete unanimity of the scholarly world on the meaning of the word *baptizein* as used in the New Testament to see that the word has no other meaning than to plunge under the surface of, to dip, to submerge. Even in the passage cited from the *Didache*, an entirely different word, *ekcheo*, is used for the action of pouring, which shows that the words are not confused in the Greek. All that the *Didache* shows is that in certain extreme cases in the 2d. century there were some in the church who were willing to recommend the substitution of pouring water three times for baptism, but it does not prove that the New Testament so allowed this, nor that the word meant anything other than complete submersion of the candidate in the element named. Careful study of such a valuable work as Shepherd's *Handbook on Baptism* will show the overwhelming position on the mode of baptism taken in the world of scholarship.

However, a much larger and more important controversy has developed in recent years over the validity of infant baptism. This has been particularly true of European Protestant theologians since World War II. I know of no modern scholar who claims that infant baptism is expressly taught or enjoined in the New Testament. Almost all will say that there is no direct evidence for its practice in the New Testament. The present controversy was set off by Karl Barth, the great neo-orthodox theologian at the University of Basel. His book, *The Teaching of the Church Concerning Baptism*, came as a bombshell to the theological world and was described by his opponent, Oscar Cullmann, as the “most serious challenge to infant baptism which has ever been offered.”⁴ This is all the more striking when it is realized that Barth is a member of the Swiss Reformed church that practices infant baptism. Barth argues the position taken through the ages by opponents of infant baptism that the very nature of baptism itself demands instruction in what God had

¹*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. VII, p. 379.

²T. M. Lindsay, “Baptism (Non-Immersionist View)” *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, Vol. I, p. 390.

³Elmer S. Freeman, “Some Protestant Thoughts On Baptism,” *Religion in Life*, Vol. XXII:1, Winter 1952-1953, p. 8.

⁴Oscar Cullmann, *Baptism in the New Testament* (London: S. C. M. Press, 1950) p. 8.

done through Jesus Christ in his death and resurrection for the salvation of man. The candidate for baptism must respond to the knowledge of God's mighty acts with faith. Because infants cannot receive this knowledge, there can be no response of faith on their part. Thus any form or ceremony calling itself baptism for such a candidate comes close to being an act of magic which in itself performs certain spiritual advantages.⁵ Barth also argues that in this present time the church involves only a small percentage of the total population. This is even true of the State churches of Europe. To be a responsible church, every member must understand the responsibility imposed upon him at baptism, and infants are incapable of doing this. Barth is here giving voice to the concern many theologians in Europe have felt over the baptizing of infants coming from homes where the parents have little or no religious interest or concern for the proper training of the child later on. Baptism in this case becomes a kind of loose attachment to the State church without any personal religious convictions or development at all.

In reply to Barth's attack, a number of books and magazine articles have appeared, particularly from theologians connected with European Protestant State churches. It is very interesting to note that in these the same arguments in a somewhat reworked form which have been used down through the ages in defense of infant baptism are to be found. Flemington tries in his book to trace the practice back to the *period* of the New Testament, while admitting that no direct evidence exists for it in the Bible.⁶ He advances the argument that infant baptism was probable in the early church due to the fact that the Jews practiced proselyte baptism in this period. It is claimed that the Jews of this period required three things of all men who became proselytes: circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice. In baptism the children they had were included and evidently were baptized along with their parents, according to Jewish tradition. However, any children born afterward did not have to be baptized. The argument is made that in modified form the early Christians probably followed the Jewish custom of having their children baptized when they were baptized, although there is no mention made of it. The question of Jewish proselyte baptism is one of the most obscure practices of Judaism. The fact that Josephus, Philo, the apocryphal writings, and early Christian literature are silent about it raises some strong suspicions regarding its widespread usage in the first century A. D. Even if it were admitted as universally practiced, the differences between Jewish proselyte baptism and the baptism practiced in the early church are so many that no case can be built up for infant baptism.

⁵Alexander C. Zabriskie, "Thoughts on Baptism," *Religion in Life*, Vol. XXII:1, Winter, 1952-1953, p. 41.

⁶Flemington, *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism*, (London: SPCK, 1948) p. 131.

Closely connected with this argument is the argument made from the "household" baptisms of Acts 16 and I Cor. 1:16. It is held that probably there were infants in these households that were baptized, and they give evidence of such a practice. Flemington emphasizes the solidarity of the Jewish family as a case in point here to advance his claim that in baptizing a household, probably infants were included. He adds that Paul addressed the children in Ephesians 6:1, speaking of them as being "in the Lord." They could only be "in the Lord" or in the church if they had previously been baptized into it. Also, he uses Col. 3:20 suggesting that children were to do that which was well-pleasing to the Lord. They are spoken to as if they were members of the church. He continues, "If children could thus be regarded as members of the church, then it would seem a justifiable inference that they had been baptized, for there is no suggestion in the Pauline Epistles that the Apostle knows of any other way of entering the Christian community."⁷ What he fails to take into account is that these passages are addressed to the children, showing that they were old enough to read, understand the injunction given, and realize their duty to their parents, and to the Lord as well. To conjecture that they must have been baptized in infancy shows how hard-pressed one must be for an argument to justify the practice. With regard to "household" baptisms, Abbott's statement that infant baptism and household baptism are not the same and do not imply the same is to the point.⁸ It must be assumed that each household had infants, and it must be further assumed that these were baptized when the record says that the households were baptized. The "believing" of the jailer's household in Acts 16:34 implies the ability to understand and have faith on the part of all of those baptized. It is amazing to see these same old threadbare arguments used in defense of a practice admittedly not found in the New Testament.

Flemington cites two vague references from Justin Martyr and the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* which he claims imply infant baptism, but a close examination of these show that the wording does not imply infant baptism at all. However, he finds his earliest reference in Irenaeus' statement, "For he came to save all through himself, all that is, who through him are born again unto God, infants, and little ones, and boys and youths and old men." (Adv. Her. II, 22.4) Here one would have to understand what Irenaeus meant by "born again" or "regenerated" to be sure that this referred to infant membership, but Irenaeus certainly did not live in the New Testament period nor represent New Testament thinking in many of his ideas and concepts. Granting that he did hold such a view would not prove the case for the practice in the New Testament period. While

⁷*Ibid.*, p. 132.

⁸J. W. Shepherd, *Handbook on Baptism* (Nashville: Gospel Advocate Co., 1912) p. 272.

admitting that Tertullian argues against it, he states that Tertullian nowhere condemns it on the ground that it was not practiced in the New Testament. However, the weakness of this type of argument from silence must be apparent to any careful student of the question. In other words, the evidence of the second century resolves itself down to the single instance of the *Didache* with its extreme case, and the teaching in Irenaeus, which is doubtful.

Flemington also advances the old argument that it parallels circumcision under the old covenant.⁹ Citing Col. 2:11,12 he says, "Thus baptism was the sign of entry into the New Covenant just as circumcision was of entry into the old."¹⁰ He states that this parallel would encourage the practice of infant baptism, since infants were circumcised under the Old Law. Lindsay in this connection says, "St. Paul connects baptism with circumcision and implies that under the gospel the former takes the place of the latter (Col. 2:12); and as children were circumcised on the 8th day after birth, the inference follows that children were also to be baptized."¹¹ Note here that the argument is based on an inference. Beyschlag, the Lutheran scholar, states, "The Abrahamic and Mosaic circumcision has no further relation to Christian baptism than that the former was the sign and seal of the Old Covenant, and the latter the sign and seal of the New Covenant. No conclusion can be drawn from this similarity for infant baptism; for, it is a very different thing to enter by birth into an allied people as the Israelite boy, and to enter by personal faith a community of believers."¹²

Flemington is frank to admit that the connection of baptism with the washing away of sin in the New Testament must be modified when infant baptism is considered. "In the New Testament this was interpreted of actual sin, but when infant baptism became more and more the universal practice of the church, some other interpretation had to be found."¹³ Thus arose the doctrine of baptism washing away, not actual sins, but original sin from the infant, since the infant could not be said to have actual sins. On this point Flemington comments,

Moreover, this teaching that baptism, in the case of infants, avails for the washing away of original sin (while *actual* sin remains as a problem to be dealt with by other means) lacks any firm scriptural foundation, and seems, historically speaking, to have been formulated largely owing to the desire to find some satisfactory explanation for the church's practice of baptizing infants.¹⁴

He also cites N. P. Williams' statement in his book, *The Ideas of the*

⁹Flemington, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

¹⁰*Loc. cit.*

¹¹T. M. Lindsay, *op. cit.*, p. 391.

¹²Shepherd, *op. cit.*, p. 223.

¹³Flemington, *op. cit.*, p. 139.

¹⁴*Loc. cit.*

Fall and of Original Sin, p. 223, "In order of time, the practice was prior to and largely stimulated the growth of, the doctrine, and not *vice versa*."¹⁵ Yet this is the major reason for the practice of infant baptism, and its presence in the creed books of many Protestant as well as Catholic denominations. When one remembers that these statements are made by scholars who belong to churches that practice infant baptism and believe the doctrine of original sin, they are the more remarkable.

Pierre Marcel, a French Protestant minister, has recently advanced the argument for infant baptism that rests upon the identity of the Old and New covenants. In his book, *The Biblical Doctrine of Infant Baptism*, he bases the major part of his argument on this position, finding the practice of circumcision under the Old justifying the practice of infant baptism under the New. To students of the Restoration Movement, this line of argument calls to mind the approach made by McCalla in his debate with Alexander Campbell in 1823. McCalla labored during a major part of the discussion trying to prove the identity of the Old and New Covenants. Campbell raised mighty objections to this position. The distinction of the Jewish nation, and the new and holy people called out spiritually from every nation in the world; the emphasis on the *new* covenant, the *new* King, the *new* mediator, the *new* high-priest, the *new* ordinances, a *new* altar and a *new* sacrifice in contrast to the *old*; the difference in a covenant ratified by the precious blood of Christ, and one ratified by the blood of animals: these all argue against the identity of the covenants. Campbell in his famous work, *Christian Baptism*, lists in convenient form 16 major points in which circumcision cannot find its parallel in baptism in the New Testament, and these points are as applicable today as when they were written.¹⁶

It is very interesting to notice in closing this brief survey that the arguments depended on today to justify the practice of infant baptism are the same old arguments men have been using through the years. Little can be discovered through the modern studies on baptism that has not already been advanced. Since Cullmann's argument will be noticed in another paper in this series, we shall not include him in this survey. Yet, it should also be noticed that there is a renewed interest in doctrinal matters, accentuated by the Ecumenical Movement among Protestants. Christians should be particularly alert to the currents of religious thinking in our time, and to the opportunities for emphasizing the power and authority of God's word.

¹⁵*Loc. cit.*

¹⁶P. 242f.

Baptism for Remission of Sins — A Critique

J. W. Roberts

Baptism for remission of sins rests squarely upon the teaching of the New Covenant. John the Baptist preached baptism for the remission of sins (Mark 1:4 *eis aphesin hamartion*). Peter after the resurrection of Jesus commanded repentance and baptism for the remission of sins (*eis aphesin hamartion*) (Acts 2:38). The meaning of this phrase is fixed for the New Covenant by its use in Matthew 26:28 and Luke 24:47. Matthew reports Jesus as saying in the Lord's Supper discourse, "This is my blood which is poured out for many unto the remission of sins (*eis aphesin hamartion*)" (Matthew 26:28). Luke has Jesus commissioning the preaching of repentance for (Greek text, B, Aleph; Nestle; W-H) *the remission of sins*. Compare the preaching of Peter "Repent and turn that your sins may be blotted out" (Acts 3:19).

With this expression of the design of baptism agrees the general teaching of the New Covenant. Compare Mark 16:16; Acts 22:16; Titus 3:5; and 1 Pet. 3:21, all of which affirm baptism to be a condition of salvation. Numerous other scriptures teach the same by showing the connection between baptism and the new life in Christ, in His body, etc. (e. g., Rom. 6:1ff; I Cor. 12:13; Gal. 3:27; Eph. 5:26).

That this is the doctrine of baptism in the New Covenant is attested by almost all scholars of all faiths. It is without question the historic position of the Church, early, medieval, and reformation. Modern scholarship is quite decisive.

Thayer's English edition of the great Grimm-Wilke (Thayer's *Greek-English Lexicon of the N. T.*) defines *eis aphesin hamartion*: "to obtain the forgiveness of sins," Acts 2:38 (p. 94b). Walter Bauer's *Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament* cites *baptidzo* "mit Angabe des Zweckes *eis aphesin t. hamartion* AG, 2, 38" (p. 240 b). This Arndt and Gingrich translate "w(ith) the purpose given *eis aphesin t. hamartion*."¹ Zorell places the use of *eis* in Acts 2:38 in the list of uses which "indicate the end to which the intention of the actor is directed; that which is looked for in the doing (the purpose, *beabsichtigte* as the German says) In meaning = to the acquiring of something." Here he cites Mt. 27:10 as a parallel: *edoke auta eis ton agron tou kerameos* "He gave these things for a field of a potter . . . for the buying of a field of a potter."² In the same cate-

¹Arndt, W. F. and Gingrich, F. W., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago, U. Press, 1957).

²"*indicatur terminus ad quem intentio agentis dirigitur, ad quod in agendo spectatur* (das *beabsichte*) . . . *in species—ad alqd. acquirendum . . . ad emendum agrum figuli*, Mt. 27:10; Acts 2:38; 11:28; Rom. 7:10. Zorell, F., *Lexicon Graecum Novi Testament* (Paris, P. Lethielleux, 1931).

gory he places Acts 11:18 "God has granted repentance unto (*eis*) life" and Rom. 7:10 the commandment was "for life . . . for death."

Hermann Cremer³ says

By *baptidzein*, therefore, we must understand a washing whose design, like that of the theocratic washings and purifications, was to purge away sin from him on whom it was performed.

After listing a number of references including both Mark 1:4 and Acts 2:38, he concludes: "So far, therefore, there is no difference between the baptism of John and Christian baptism, both aim at the *aphesis ha-* "forgiveness of s(ins)."

Among older works Samuel Green in his *Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament* says, "The material (water, fire, the Holy Spirit) is expressed by *dat.*, *eis*, or *en*; the purpose or result by *eis*). The same words almost identically appear in Dr. Geo. Ricker Berry's *New Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament*.

Among newer works nothing stands higher in its field than the great *Theological-Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* edited by Gerhard Kittel. In this great work Albrecht Oepke, who does the section on the words connected with the root *bapt-*, discusses the syntactical connections with the verb *baptidzo*. After discussing such expressions as "baptize with a baptism" (the verb followed by the inner object), the prepositional uses of *baptidzein en* and *eis* (of the elements of baptism), he says, "But *eis* is most often final (i.e., "purpose" JWR), designating *eis metanoian* Mt. 3:11 ("unto repentance" JWR); *eis aphasis ton hamartion*, AG. 2, 38 ("for the remission of sins" JWR); *eis hen soma* 1 Cor. 12:13 ("into one body" JWR).⁴

In the section on "sin" in the same work, Grundmann⁵ also discusses the forgiveness of sins in the teachings of the Apostles. He says

The story of Jesus is contained in the work of the apostles, who preach Christ as the saving gift of God, calling for repentance and baptism in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins in clear accord with what he himself did (Acts 2:38).

This position Grundmann clarifies by a footnote in which he defends the connection between baptism and forgiveness by citing parallel scriptures: Luke 24:47; Acts 3:19; 13:38; 22:16; and 26:18.

This list could be extended indefinitely. Checking a list of grammars and commentaries, one finds *eis* listed for this passage as purpose (final or telic) in the following works: Winer, *N. T. Grammar* (p. 397); Vincent, *M. R., Word Studies in the N. T.* (p. 280); F. J. Knowling, *Expositor's Greek Testament*, Vol. 2; Meyer's *Com-*

³Cremer, Hermann, *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek*, (N. Y., Scribner's, 1895) p. 126f.

⁴*Theologisches Woerterbuch*, Vol. 1, p. 537.

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 308. See this material translated in *Bible Key Words*, J. R. Coates, Jr. (N. Y., Harper, 1951), pp. 70f.

mentary on the New Testament;⁶ E. De Witt Burton, *International Critical Commentary on Galatians*,⁷ C. F. D. Moule, *Idiom Book of N. T. Greek* (p. 70); F. F. Bruce's new commentary on Acts (p. 75-77),⁸ etc., etc.

This material suggests that the understanding is so universal that it is rather surprising that any group would attack it on linguistic or grammatical grounds. Indeed the only group which really does so is the Baptists. Many people may deny the doctrine in practice on theological grounds by making the remission merely formal or symbolic; but the modern Baptists, especially the Southern Baptist groups, have made a strong effort to establish that the exegesis of which the above is a sampling is grammatically wrong. If this is so, scholarship has certainly gone astray.

The contention that "for the remission of sins" in Acts 2:38 means "because of the remission of sins already received" is strongly urged by several recent grammars, commentaries, and monographs among the Baptist people.

One might begin with the work of the grammarian A. T. Robertson of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.⁹ Throughout his published works Robertson straddles the fence between the theological and grammatical. He never denies that "*eis* the remission of sins" in Acts 2:38 can be purpose; indeed, he insists that that is the use in Matt. 26:28 (*Historical Grammar* p. 595) and says that "it may be so used" (*Ibid.*, 389) and that purpose may be the true idea "in the abstract" in Acts 2:38 (*Ibid.*, p. 595). Robertson merely muddies the water with doubts and says that "the theologian must step in when the grammarian gets through." Robertson's work was followed by that of Dana and Mantey,¹⁰ who list a casual use of *eis* as a "remote" use of the preposition and try to include Acts 2:38 in the remote list, while admitting that "If one considers repentance as

⁶Meyer's says, "*eis* denotes the object of the baptism, which is the remission of the guilt contracted in the state before metanoia" (repentance).

⁷Burton's comment is especially significant, since he was one of the greatest grammarians produced in the last half century. His *Syntax of New Testament Moods and Tenses* has been widely used. He says concerning the use of the verb *baptidzo* that it is used "in the telic sense, 'in order to obtain' Acts 2:38." Comment on Galatians 3:27.

⁸Bruce, F. F., *The New International Commentary on the New Testament, The Book of Acts* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1956).

⁹A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek N. T. in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville, Broadman Press, 1934), pp. 389, 592, 595; *A New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament* (with Dr. W. H. Davis) (N. Y., Harper's, 1933), p. 256; *Word Pictures in the N. T.*, 6 Vols. (N. Y., Harper's, 1930 etc.) *passim*.

¹⁰Mantey, J. R. and Dana, H. E., *A Manual Grammar of the Greek N. T.* (N. Y., Macmillan, 1934) p. 104.

self-renunciation and baptism as a public expression and self-dedication to Christ, which significance it certainly had in the first century, the expression *eis aphesin t. ha.* may mean for the purpose of the remission of sins."

Among the scholarly articles and monographs which have recently appeared, Dr. Mantey has attempted proof in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* of a causal use of *eis*.¹¹ But Dr. Ralph Marcus in reply "at the risk of appearing ungrateful for his brave attempt to go beyond the standard lexicons and grammars" demonstrated that Mantey confuses cause with purpose (see below) and showed a basic lack of grasp of the idiom in his attempted parallels in the LXX, Josephus, and non-biblical sources for a causal *eis*.¹²

Other typical examples of the same effort which might be cited are the article "Water Baptism" in the *Review and Expositor*¹³ of January 1957 by Dr. J. Walter Carpenter and the monograph *Is Baptism Essential to Salvation?* by Austin Crouch and copyrighted by the Broadman Press.¹⁴ Both of these are prime examples of dogmatic exegesis by which every device is employed to escape the obvious and traditionally received meanings of the passages that treat of the purpose of baptism.¹⁵

¹¹Mantey, J. R., "The Causal Use of *eis* in the New Testament," *J. B. L.* LXX (1951), pp. 45-48; "On Causal *eis* again," *Ibid.*, 309-311.

¹²Marcus, Ralph, "On Causal *eis*," *Ibid.*, 129-130; "The Elusive Causal *eis*," *Ibid.*, LXXI (1952), pp. 43-44.

¹³J. Walter Carpenter, "Water Baptism," *Review and Expositor*, LIV (Jan. 1957), pp. 58-66. This publication is edited by the faculty of Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

¹⁴Austin Crouch, *Is Baptism Essential to Salvation?* (Nashville, Broadman Press, 1953).

¹⁵For instance, Dr. Carpenter says that as a preacher who once preached "baptismal regeneration" he began to have doubts about the doctrine when he read the scriptures on "eternal security." But the scriptures which concern eternal security (salvation) use the word salvation with a different categorical meaning from those which speak of salvation from past or alien sins. He learned (he says) that salvation is "by faith" and "not of works" so he rejected the idea that "water baptism is essential to salvation" as though baptism is either incompatible with faith or is a work of human merit! To him John 3:5 "born of water" means "born on the word" or "refers to the natural physical birth"—neither of which opinions has ever commended itself to competent commentators. 1 Pet. 3:21 couldn't mean that baptism saves "for only Jesus saves," besides the "eight souls" were not saved by immersion "but by riding on top of the water"!

Mr. Crouch is scarcely less ingenious as an exegete: Peter could not have meant baptism for remission of sins "for in another place he declares that baptism is a figure of salvation" (p. 40). One

The total effect of such irresponsible scholarship is to lead astray those of the same faith who do not have the technical training to discover for themselves the facts as they are. Preachers of this faith are encouraged by the position of their "scholars" to take extreme positions. A typical example might be cited from a public discussion on the question of baptism where it is asserted with reference to *eis* with the meaning "in order to": "You can't find it in any authentic translations of the Bible and you can't find it in any authentic lexicon of the Greek."¹⁶ With this one might compare the earlier quotations in this article.

These efforts are not typical of Baptist scholars as a whole. Earlier Baptist scholars, such as Dr. J. W. Wilmarth¹⁷ or the able commentator H. B. Hackett,¹⁸ are much more representative of the scholarship of this faith. The translations by Charles B. Williams¹⁹ and

wonders what this use of the type-antitype analogy would do to our salvation by Christ in Rom. 5:14 where Christ is the figure or antitype of Adam. Mr. Crouch argues that baptism and repentance could not be necessary to obtain remission of sins because in Luke 24:46f repentance and remission of sins are enjoined "in the name of Jesus" (which means "faith in Christ") and "Christ does not mention baptism" (p. 44). How baptism is extracted from such passages as John 3:5, Titus 3:5; etc. space forbids to tell. The following exegesis of Eph. 5:26 can hardly be withheld: "In Greek, there is no preposition before *loutron* ('by the washing of water' JWR). If a preposition is used, it has to be inserted by the translator. The question arises as to what preposition should be inserted. Should it be in, through, with, or like? If the preposition were 'like,' then it could mean he cleansed her like a bath, i. e. like the bath of water cleansed the bride." Of course, *to loutro* (an instrumental use of the dative form) needs no preposition to express its meaning in Greek; the instrumental case demands the prepositional translation in English, though that preposition would hardly be "like," which certainly would have been expressed by *hos*.

¹⁶Mr. L. S. Ballard in the *Ballard-Warren Debate* (Longview, Washington, Telegram Book Co., 1953) p. 178. Though Mr. Ballard may not belong to the same Baptist Association as these other men, he uses their arguments.

¹⁷"The truth will never suffer by giving to 'eis' its true significance. When the Campbellites translate 'in order to' in Acts 2:38, they translate correctly. . . We conclude without hesitation in accordance with such authorities as Hackett, Winer, Meyer, that the proper rendering of *eis aphesin hamarton* in Acts 2:38 as in Matt. 26:28 is 'unto,' 'for,' that is, 'in order to.' 'In order to declare' or 'symbolize' would be a monstrous translation of *eis*. If it ever means 'with reference to' in a sense of a retrospective and commemorative reference to a past event, we have failed to find an example." *Baptist Quarterly*, July, 1877.

¹⁸"Submit to the rite in order to be forgiven." *Commentary on the Acts of Apostles*, (Philadelphia, American Baptist Pub. Soc. 1882) Comment on Acts 22:18.

¹⁹"that you may have your sins forgiven," Williams, Charles B., *The New Testament*, (Chicago, Moody Press, 1952).

Dr. Edgar J. Goodspeed²⁰ are also examples of Baptist scholarship which eschews dogmatic doctrinal interpretation.

It will not be amiss to examine a few objections raised to the doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins:

Sacramentalism. One thing which Robertson frequently relied on to refute the idea that baptism is a condition of salvation is that such a doctrine is "sacramentalism" and Paul and the New Testament writers "were not sacramentalists." See his comment on Acts 2:38 in *Word Pictures*. On Romans 6:3 he says

The translation "into" makes Paul say that the union with Christ was brought to pass by means of baptism, which is not his idea, for Paul was not a sacramentarian. *eis* is at bottom the same word as *en*. Baptism is the public proclamation of one's inward spiritual relation to Christ attained before the baptism.²¹

But is there no choice between baptism as a sacrament and baptism as an empty symbol? Is there no choice between the understanding of baptism as a sacrament in which the validity is in the act performed in the name of Jesus without regard to whether the recipient is an infant or a hypocrite (that is, without regard to faith and penitence of the baptized) and an understanding of baptism as an act of faith of a penitent believer obeying a command which the Lord in his own name has made a condition of pardon? The preachers of the Restoration Movement have been as strongly against any magical or "sacramental" efficacy in baptism as anyone else. They have repudiated both the Roman Catholic doctrine of baptismal regeneration and infant baptism.

It is quite another thing to insist on the Bible teaching that baptism to a penitent believer is for (in order to) the remission of sins. This is the form the proposition usually takes in public discussions. The New Covenant sees baptism as an act of faith (Gal. 3:26-27; Col. 2:12f); it is a part of that "obedience of faith" unto which the Gospel was proclaimed (Rom. 16:26); it is connected with faith as a condition of salvation (Mk. 16:16) and with repentance as a condition of pardon or remission (Acts 2:38). It is precisely in this respect that the Campbells and Scott in the early Restoration Movement saw their declaration of baptism for remission of sins upon a confession of faith in Christ as a "restoration" of the primitive practice following the centuries of "sacramentalism" in Roman and Protestant theology.

*Disjunction of "Repent" and "Be Baptized" in Acts 2:38.*²¹ There

²⁰"in order to have your sins forgiven" *The New Testament An American Translation*, (Chicago, University Press, 1923).

²¹The argument seemingly arose in a book by A. P. Williams, *Campbellism Exposed* (1860). It has often been used; compare *Hardeman-Bogard Debate*; *Smith-Bogard Debate* etc. An extended refutation will be found in an article ("Acts 2:38—A Study in Syntax," *Gospel Advocate* XC (1948) pp. 704f) by this writer.

is an old quibble which would make baptism for the remission of sins mean "because of" remission and disjoin it from the command "repent." This is necessary in order to avoid a conjunctive force of "and" (*kai*) which would also make repentance "because of" remission. One is not surprised to find such an argument in dogmatic works like that of Crouch²² or in the work of a popular Baptist polemist,²³ but it is hardly expected in such a person as Robertson, who says²⁴

Change of number from plural to singular and of person from second to third. This change marks a break in the thought here that the English translation does not preserve. The first thing to do is make a radical and complete change of heart and life. Then let each one be baptized after this change has taken place. . .

Robertson does not follow this point up, but he was aware the point is only used to countenance the idea that *eis* could not modify both verbs. This is pure puerility. Compare the comment of Hackett who says that remission of sins is "naturally connected with both preceding verbs." The distribution of the plural subject in "Ye Repent" by the use of the third singular *hekastos* ("each one") with a singular verb is such a natural and common idiom that a claim that they do not take the same modifier is not worth noticing. Dr. Cadbury once said

The grammar of the sentence in Acts 2:38 is perfectly regular and better Greek than if the author had kept the second person plural "baptize" after using the singular "each." I have no doubt that another author would have written "Do ye repent," and "be ye baptized," each one of you. But this writer seems to have preferred the less loose construction. I think that there would be no essential difference in meaning.²⁵

The Causal Use of eis. Reference has already been made to the argument over the attempt to make *eis* causal. Robertson makes much of this attempt.²⁶ The argument is copied by Crouch²⁷ and in another form by Carpenter.²⁸ Dana and Mantey list "because of" among the "remote" meanings of *eis* and cite Rom. 4:20; Mt. 3:11; Mk. 2:18; Rom. 11:32 and Titus 3:14 as examples.²⁹

Several observations are in order. The first is that because a

²²*Ibid.*, p. 38.

²³e. g., L. S. Ballard in *Warren-Ballard Debate*, p. 146. The point is here well discussed. Warren has collected a number of authorities who show that the argument is without foundation.

²⁴*Word Pictures*, loc. cit.

²⁵Quoted in *Warren-Ballard Debate* (op. cit., p. 164).

²⁶*Historical Grammar*, p. 592.

²⁷*Op. cit.*, p. 42.

²⁸*Op. cit.*, p. 62.

²⁹*Op. cit.*, p. 104.

causal sense would "make sense" in a given construction does not prove that this is the intended sense. This is especially true when the customary meaning of the form will make sense also. Many of the "examples" of "causal *eis*" are of this type. Again, it has long been noted, even by ancient writers, that there is little difference between causal and telic statements especially in statements about the past. If one said, "I went to town because of a suit (of clothes)," he would naturally be understood to mean not because he already had a suit, but in order to buy one. This is a loose use of causal expressions, but it is common. It follows that if a causal *eis* is established, it must be a clear-cut case of retrospective action in order to parallel the argument on Acts 2:38. Further it ought to be obvious that if such a clear example is found (which has not been found), that it does not follow that Acts 2:38 is another such example. Certainly purpose is the natural sense of the construction where the two imperatives with a conjunction follow the question. It is quite certain that if there were no doctrinal issue involved a causal meaning would never even be suspected.

All the samples of so-called causal uses will bear closer scrutiny. Mk. 2:18 is evidently a misprint; there is no *eis* in the text. In Rom. 11:32 *suvekleisen eis* ("shut up together into") is the regular idiom for handling over or shutting something *to* or *into* something: a pregnant use with the idea of giving over so that nothing escapes (Sandy, ICC); compare 2 Mac. 5:5; Lk. 5:6; Gal. 3:22f. In Titus 3:14 ("Let our people learn to apply themselves to good works for (*eis*) necessary needs") the *eis* is hardly causal, especially in the sense "because the needs have been met." The Revised Standard Version takes it as purpose, translating "so as to help cases of urgent need." Nor does the causal sense in Rom. 4:20 ("He wavered not in unbelief *eis* the promise of God") commend itself. The promise was not the cause of Abraham's unwavering; he did not waver "at" the promise; he believed it in all its staggering implications.

Matthew 3:11 and 12:41 deserve more adequate treatment than space here permits. It is enough that there are natural explanations which fit the context which allow the preposition its usual force without seeking "remote" meanings. The more common explanation of Matt. 3:11 "I baptize unto (*eis*) repentance" is that the baptism of John bound those receiving it to a life of continued repentance. It is adopted by Lenski; the RSV says "for repentance"; Allen (ICC) says, "It symbolized both a present and a future state of repentance." This is the natural meaning; why seek for another? Matt. 12:41 reads "They repented at (*eis*) the preaching of Jonah." Notice that "preaching" is not the participle or the action noun but the well-known *kerugma* "message" or "proclamation" of Jonah. "Because John preached" misses the point. Thayer is undoubtedly right in holding that it indicates the direction toward which their repentance looked. Compare Acts 20:21 "repentance toward (*eis*) God; faith

toward (*eis*) Jesus Christ." Thus Blass-Debrunner³⁰ says it has the sense of *epi* or *pros* and cites Herodotus (3.52): *pros touto to kerugma* of the attitude of subjects "toward" the proclamation of a king.

Static eis. Another argument is based upon the so-called "static" use of *eis*. It is claimed that the preposition is originally derived from *en* and at bottom they are the same. Furthermore it is claimed that there is in the Koine an interchange of *eis* and *en*. Thus *eis* is supposed to locate something that is "at rest" or static rather than being directional as most uses of *eis* are. Robertson³¹ has a lengthy discussion and says that sphere "may be the idea" in Acts 2:38. Remember that in *Word Pictures* he claimed that the preposition in Acts 2:38 is causal. It can hardly be both causal and static at the same time. Crouch³² holds to the causal use; but Carpenter³³ claims that the clear and definite meaning is static. He would translate as though *eis* were the old form of the preposition *en* ("in"). Thus we have to be baptized in the remission of sins (in the state of).

Robertson admits that most such examples of static *eis* are really to be explained as pregnant uses, where the single expression combines the elements of both "going into" and "resting in." Robert L. Johnston has shown that all of Luke-Acts' uses of this type may be explained thus.³⁴ The use of *eis* "for" *en* is "vulgar" Greek as Deissman says³⁵ and to find it in Luke would be most surprising. In his discussion of *eis* and *en* Robertson forgets all that he has contended for elsewhere about the necessity of interpreting prepositions in the light of their original meanings *plus* the force of the case with which they are used (in this instance the case of *extension*—the accusative). Robertson claims this is the only "scientific" method.³⁶ This holds for *eis* and *en* in good Greek.

Finally it ought to be remembered that both the "static" and the "causal" argument deprive repentance of its biblical place in the plan of salvation as well as baptism, since it is joined by the conjunctive *kai* ("and"). Even if the disjunctive argument based on the difference in person and number were successful, Luke 24:47 (as has been shown) in the Greek text describes repentance as being *eis* the remission of sins.

³⁰Blass, F., and Debrunner, A., *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Goettingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949) Sec. 207.1.

³¹*Historical Grammar*, p. 592.

³²*Ibid.*, p. 42

³³*Ibid.*, p. 62.

³⁴*A Study of the Interchangeability of eis and en in Acts and Luke* (Unpublished Thesis, Library Abilene Christian College, 1955).

³⁵Deissmann, *Light From the Ancient East* (N. Y., Harper, 4th Ed. 1922) p. 179 fn.).

³⁶*Ibid.*, p. 568.

BOOK REVIEWS

Karl Barth, *The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism*. (London: SCM Press, 1948) 64 pp. 2/6.

Oscar Cullmann, *Baptism in the New Testament*. (Chicago: Alec R. Allenson Inc., 1956) 84 pp. \$1.50.

Karl Barth has occupied a dominant position in modern Protestantism ever since the publication of his commentary on Romans in 1918. Trained under the old liberal tradition of Ritschl and Harnack, he became acutely aware that liberalism had no gospel at all, when, as a young minister, he faced the task of preaching to a congregation disillusioned by war. He came to the discovery that the Biblical message is concerned with God's Word to man, and not man's discovery of God. His presuppositions are Calvinistic, and therefore the emphasis in his theology is laid on the activity of God rather than on the response of man. In sounding forth this outlook from Zurich, Barth became the modern progenitor of neo-orthodoxy and its followers Niebuhr and Tillich.

Barth's little book, in which he attacks infant baptism, caused a storm in theological circles. In reply, a new edition of Joachim Jeremias' *Hat die Urkirche die Kindertaufe geuebt?* appeared, in which infant baptism is defended. Then Cullmann took issue with Barth in his *Die Tauflehre des Neuen Testaments*, of which the second book under review is the English translation.

Barth finds the origin of Christian baptism in the baptism of Jesus, and considers all other references to baptism as ratifying and enforcing passages. He thus tries to find a continuity between John's practice and that commanded by Jesus that does not actually exist. John himself contrasts his baptism with that of the one "greater than I." The case of the rebaptized followers of John in Acts 19:1-5 would appear to be the Achilles heel of this contention.

For Barth the grace of God is found in the declaration of God's act and its reception by faith. God's operation in baptism is presented as having *cognitive significance*, and not *causal efficacy*. It is along this line that he contends for baptism of adults only. At best, his insistence against infant baptism is half-hearted. His paradoxes appear more like contradictions. He first de-emphasizes the need of baptism, "The free word and work of Christ can make use of other means." At the same time, however, baptism is always efficacious. Baptism without the willingness and readiness of the candidate is true and effective baptism, "but is not correct." It is a "clouded baptism," and this is why infant baptism is not to be despised. Even this kind of baptism has a lasting value, for the baptized henceforth "cannot anymore deviate, weak, erring, foolish, wicked though he still is and will be." It does not make any difference whether the candidate understands or not, it is efficacious (p. 35). Barth actually states in this context that he does not intend to explain baptism in favor of the Anabaptists, and his disregard for Biblical passages, especially Acts 19, illustrates how far his arguments are theologically orientated.

Barth insists that the matter be approached exegetically. Characteristically, he explains the blessing of the children, Matt. 19:13f., by stating that the Kingdom is greater than the church, and that the children could therefore enter it without being in the church. This is also his interpretation of I Cor. 7:14; Acts 2:39; Matt. 28:19. He correctly interprets Col. 2:11ff. in the light of Rom. 4. The only thin thread to which advocates of infant baptism could hold, are the passages which speak of the baptism of households, Acts 16:15; 18:8; I Cor. 1:16, and Acts 16:33, but in these narratives it is noted that the sequence is preaching, faith, baptism, which would exclude infants.

Barth recognizes the difficulty of the defenders of infant baptism in clarifying the relationship between faith and baptism. The most commonly held view today, that the decisive faith of the baptized child is that which is authenticated in later life, is unsatisfactory to him, for this would make baptism only a "half-sacrament."

The weakness of Barth's position becomes evident when it is recognized that he is using this discussion in his agitation against the institutional state church. Barth is contending for a confessional church, and he recognizes infant baptism as one of the main obstacles to his ideal. The impossibility of his task lies in the fact that he shares his Calvinistic theology with the state church. His theology, and not the Bible, determines where he will come out. This is well illustrated by the fact that he quotes kindred souls among the Reformers in the same manner that he quotes Paul and Luke.

Oscar Cullmann's reply to Barth is more stimulating. Cullmann is the most rewarding New Testament theologian today. He challenges the reader, even if the latter does disagree vehemently. Some of the arguments in the book under review appear in his latest work, *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments*, which is one of the great mileposts on the subject. In answering Barth, Cullmann recognizes that there are no explicit instances of infant baptism in the New Testament, and he therefore approaches the subject with the question whether the New Testament admits of infant baptism.

The first chapter develops the argument that baptism in the New Testament is closely associated with the vicarious suffering of Christ, Rom. 6:3ff.; Mk. 10:30; Lk. 12:50. Very convincingly, he interprets Jesus' own baptism as a call to fulfill the mission of the suffering Messiah of Isa. 42 and 53. The fulfillment of this work, namely the atoning death, is the presupposition of Christian baptism. This is the "general baptism" for all men. This baptism of Jesus is offered to all men in entire independence of the decision of faith of the baptized. "Baptismal grace has its foundation here, and it is in the strictest sense 'prevenient grace'" (p. 20).

Cullmann especially disagrees with Barth in Chapter II on how the benefits of Christ's deed are conveyed to man. Barth required understanding on the part of man, but for Cullmann the concept of

the church as the Body of Christ is determinative. Baptism is the grafting into this Body. Children of believers are regarded as belonging to the Body, on the basis of I Cor. 7:14. It is emphasized that in proselyte baptism the children were baptized with their parents, and it is hinted that this influenced the Christian practice. However, this remains just a "*possibility of an indirect proof*" (p. 25). He also points out with vigor that there are in the New Testament "fewer traces, indeed none at all, of the baptism of adults born of parents already Christian and brought up by them" (p. 26). This would imply the possibility of infant baptism in Christian families. Cullmann argues from silence here, which is a dangerous practice at best, and totally disregards the later historical evidence that clearly illustrates the introduction of infant baptism. Cullmann has great difficulty when he has to spell out the relationship between baptism and faith. He recognizes that there is a relationship between baptism and faith and the Holy Spirit, and that there is not Christian baptism without the Spirit. This poses a problem about the faith of the infant. Here "reference *ought* to be made and *must* be made to the *faith* of the congregation assembled for the baptism, which stands behind the operation of the Spirit" (p. 42). Cullmann here makes the mistake that the congregation is responsible for the faith, instead of vice versa. It is remarkable that Rom. 10 is absent in his discussion of faith.

He continues his discussion on baptism and faith in Chapter III, in which his argument is based on the assumption that baptism is essentially "a sacrament of reception," and that it "points to the future," and demands a future human response. In Chapter IV he again looks to proselyte baptism and circumcision to explain the Christian counterparts. Cullmann is more facile in his treatment of proselytism than the evidence of dating and influence of these practices allow us to be. In an Appendix, he discusses "Traces of An Ancient Baptismal Formula in the New Testament."

Cullmann's work has the admirable characteristic of stimulating the reader to further study. He is thought-provoking, and deserves a wide circulation among ministers.

Abraham J. Malherbe

Lexington, Massachusetts

DID THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH PRACTICE INFANT BAPTISM?

Book review of D. Dr. Joachim Jeremias, Professor of Theology, University of Goettingen, Germany: *Hat die Urkirche die Kindertaufe geuebt?* (*Did The Primitive Church Practice Infant Baptism?*), 2nd completely revised edition, 1949, Publishing House Vandenhoeck & Rprecht, 49 pages, price DM 2.50 (ca. \$.60).

Until recently the newer text-books of New Testament theology have been silent in regard to infant baptism except when they mention the fact—as does H. J. Holtzmann—that in the

N. T. nothing is said about infant baptism. Still twenty years ago *communis opinio* (general opinion) was: the N. T. nowhere mentions infant baptism (we will have to test this statement as to its truthfulness); consequently an *argumentum e silentio* (argument from silence) teaches that it is unknown; since Irenaeus testifies to its existence it originated after the middle of the 2nd century.

With these words Jeremias begins his famous treatise. The author then summarizes the new theological efforts (1928-1949) to sustain the practice of infant baptism by appealing to extra-Biblical as well as New Testament authority. He particularly mentions the writings of Oepke, Leipoldt, and Cullmann who have tried anew to prove the practice of infant baptism primitive by an appeal to contemporary Jewish and heathen customs, to patristic writings and usage, as well as to inferences from New Testament passages. However, Jeremias also mentions the efforts of Windisch and Michaelis who registered their criticisms to these conclusions. Beginning from this survey of the newest development of the problem under consideration Jeremias approaches the question in two principal divisions: The Historical Origin Of The Christian Rite Of Baptism and The Witness Of The New Testament.

The Historical Origin Of The Christian Rite Of Baptism

Christian baptism is connected with the baptism of John the Baptist.

What prompted John the Baptist to baptize? It is no question that the baptism of John can only be compared to proselyte baptism, viewing all of the washings of his closer surroundings: like proselyte baptism it is immersion (*Untertauchtaufe*), it cannot be repeated, it has sacramental meaning, it includes ethical responsibilities; above all, it has that characteristic in common with proselyte baptism which differentiates this from all other Jewish washings (*Tauchbaeder*): The baptismal candidate does not perform it 'for himself' . . . (pp. 12, 13)

The most serious objection to this theory is How could John the Baptist apply proselyte baptism, meant for heathen converts to Judaism, to his Jewish hearers? This question is answered and thereby turned around to strengthen Jeremias' above thesis by the following main thoughts: (1) The historical evidence for proselyte baptism is found in the idea developed toward the close of the first century B.C. that the heathen themselves were legally unclean (not only their idols, as heretofore believed) and, therefore, "the necessity of a cleansing bath at conversion was given" (p. 14). The evidence offered by the author for the existence of proselyte baptism in pre-Christian times is a recorded discussion between the schools of Schammai and Hillel which presupposes its existence. Proselyte baptism, then, was practiced in John's day and motivated his baptism of repentance. (2) The attempt to give Scriptural authority for proselyte baptism is made in the complicated, somewhat far-fetched fashion of Rabbinical tradition by referring Num. 15:14 to

this practice: As Israel was baptized before being received into the covenant at Sinai (I Cor. 10:1), thus the heathen convert is subjected to proselyte baptism before his full covenant privileges. (3) Now the baptism of John also is an antitype of Israel's experience in the desert:

John performs the cleansing of the generation of the time of the end (der endzeitlichen Generation) for the reception of salvation, as announced by the prophets and typified before in the symbol of the baptism of the desert generation. (p. 17)

Inasmuch as the Jewish congregation needed a cleansing before the coming of the Messiah it was in a similar position to the proselyte. That explains why John applied proselyte baptism to the Jews. Concluding this line of reasoning Jeremias says:

From what is said follows: Christian baptism is connected, as far as the rite is concerned, with proselyte baptism through the baptism of John. (p. 17)

For the author the consequences are obvious: Proselyte baptism did include the children of heathen converts. Thus Jeremias tries to prove by an appeal to the Tannaitic traditions, the oldest Rabbinical sources, discussing the legal aspects of the reception of heathen children and babies into the Jewish covenant. The first proselyte baptism of children expressly mentioned is found in the writings of Rabh Huna (ca. 212-297) and his followers. Jeremias goes on to conclude:

After what has been said it is to be received as obvious, until the opposite is proved, that also in the question of infant baptism the Christian baptismal practice corresponded to that of proselyte baptism, i.e. that at conversion from heathenism to Christianity children of all ages, including babies, were baptized. (p. 22)

The Witness Of The New Testament

The N. T. has been written from the standpoint of mission work. It is not surprising, therefore, when the conversion of adults and their baptism occupies the central territory altogether. However, material is not lacking for the problem with which we are concerned, whether the primitive Christians practiced infant baptism.

When we now turn to this material wishing to get a clear picture we have to distinguish carefully between the baptism among new converts (Uebertritts-Kinder-Taufe) and infant baptism among church members (Gemeinde-Kinder-Taufe), i. e. between the question: Were the children of heathen and Jews baptized also when the parents joined the Christian church? and the question: Were the children baptized who were born in Christian marriage?

In order to save space an outline of Jeremias' major arguments is given whereby he tries to sustain his positions:

1. The Baptism Of Infants At The Conversion Of The Parents:

Proposition:

At the conversion of heathen houses to Christianity the children also were baptized from their earliest age (vom Saeuglingsalter ab). At the conversion of Jewish houses too, the children likewise were baptized, in all likelihood without any limitation of age, also. (pp. 27, 28)

Proof:

- a) The baptism of whole houses (Acts). Stress is laid on the joint action of the whole family (Familiensolidaritaet).
- b) The pattern of proselyte baptism.
- c) Baptism as the Christian circumcision (Col. 2:11).
- d) Patristic witnesses: Polycarp of Smyrna and Justin Martyr.
- e) Tombstone inscriptions of the Priscilla Catacombs (3rd century).
- f) Acts 2:39 for children of Jewish converts.

2. The Baptism Of Infants Born In Christian Marriage:

Proposition:

As far as the witness of our texts permits conjectures and inferences—the scarceness of the material forces this careful formulation—the apostolic church has, approximately between 60 and 70, passed over to the practice of baptizing, besides the children of converts (baptized from the very beginning), also those children that were born in the church. And that as babies! Before the 4th century there is no other form of Christian infant baptism testified or even hinted at as the baptism of babies (at conversion: the baptism of children of all ages down to the babies). The early-Christian inscriptions which, until the beginning of the 4th century, only know of the baptism of babies among Christian-born children, agree completely with the witness of the old Fathers in this matter. (p. 47)

Proof:

- a) The witness of the old church (Patristic literature): Polycarp, Justin, Origenes, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Hyppolitus, the Council of Carthage (251 or 253). Tombstone inscriptions of the 3rd century.
- b) The Witness of the apostolic period: argument from I Cor. 7:14.
- c) The turning point (between 60 and 70): Hinted at in the Gospels (text of blessing of the children, Mark 10:13-16 and parallels) as well as in the testimonials of Polycarp, Justin, and Origin, and the critical study of I Cor. 7:14. It is furthermore impossible, that there were two different kinds of Christians in the apostolic church: baptized church-members (children of converts) and unbaptized church-members (children of Christians). For the sake of uniformity most certainly all children were baptized.

EVALUATION

Some of the main objections to Jeremias' book may be summarized

as follows: (1) The author presents his liberal viewpoint which rules out inspiration. For the ordinance of baptism, not a command of God but a historical development, must be traced by all means to satisfy the modernist. (2) The main argument from proselyte baptism is singularly weak because it has no divine sanction in the Bible, because historically it is not at all clearly proved for the pre-Christian era, and because it overlooks completely the essential distinction between the fleshly and the spiritual nature of both the Old and New Covenant, respectively, and their ordinances. (3) The author is responsible for some very forced interpretations of Bible passages in order to suit his theories, e. g., his explanations of I Cor. 7:14 and I Cor. 10:1, 2. (4) Infant baptism is inferred confidentially from doubtful or weak Patristic texts. (5) Jeremias completely disregards the principal apostolic explanation of the nature of Christian baptism as given in Rom. 6, Col. 2 and elsewhere. (6) The whole treatise is founded on daring combinations and suppositions. The author frankly admits the scarceness of his material and his repeated recourse to speculation.

Dieter Alten

Hamburg, Germany

INDEX TO VOLUME I—1957

Callie Faye Milliken

ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE. A list of recent theses in Bible and Bible related studies	130
<i>The Acts of the Apostles.</i> F. F. BRUCE. Review by Frank Pack	144
Alten, Dieter. Review of JEREMIAS: <i>Did the Primitive Church Practice Infant Baptism?</i>	237
ALTEN, DIETER. Personalalia	237
Ancient comment on instrumental music in the Psalms. WM. GREEN	3
ARCHEOLOGY. The Old Testament and archeology. JOHN A. SCOTT	41
AUGUSTINE. The Christian view of history. WM. A. GREEN	99
BAPTISM	
Baptism and faith. J. D. THOMAS	166
Baptism in the medieval church. FAUSTO SALVONI	198
Baptism in the Restoration movement. CARL SPAIN	213
Baptism from the second to the fourth century. E. FERGUSON	185
Jewish proselyte baptism. PAT E. HARRELL	159
Notes on religious washings in the Graeco-Roman world. ABE MALHERBE	152
The spiritual significance of baptism. JAMES D. WILLEFORD	172
The use of Bapto in the Old Testament. JOHN SCOTT	147
BAPTISM. DESIGN. Baptism for remission of sins—a critique. J. W. ROBERTS	226
Baptism and faith. J. D. THOMAS	166
Baptism for remission of sins—a critique. J. W. ROBERTS	226
Baptism from the second to the fourth century. EVERETT FERGUSON	185
Baptism in the medieval church. FAUSTO SALVONI	198
<i>Baptism in the New Testament.</i> CULLMANN. Review by Abe Malherbe	235
Baptism in the Restoration movement. CARL SPAIN	213
BAPTISM OF INFANTS. Some modern views of infant baptism. Frank Pack	220
Baptismal confession. WILLIAM B. DECKER	180
BAPTISTS. This name Baptist. R. L. ROBERTS, JR.	177
The bearing of the use of particles on the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. J. W. ROBERTS	132
BIBLE. INTERPRETATION	
Principles of Biblical interpretation in the Restoration movement. PAUL SOUTHERN	9
Meaning from context. JAMES M. TOLLE	76
BIBLE. N. T. GOSPELS. The synoptic problem. HUGO McCORD	51
BIBLE. N. T. TIMOTHY AND TITUS. GENUINENESS. The bearing of the use of particles on the authorship of the pastoral Epistles. J. W. ROBERTS	132
BIBLE. O. T. PSALMS. Ancient comment on instrumental music in the Psalms. WILLIAM GREEN	3
<i>The Book of Acts in History.</i> CADBURY. Review by Roy Bowen Ward	94
BOOK REVIEWS	
BARTH, KARL. <i>The Teachings of the Church Regarding Baptism.</i> (Abraham J. Malherbe)	235

BARRETT, C. K. <i>The New Testament Background: Selected Documents.</i> (Everett Ferguson)	91
BRUCE, F. F. <i>Commentary on the Book of Acts.</i> (Frank Pack)	143
BRUCE, F. F. <i>The Acts of Apostles.</i> (Frank Pack)	144
CADBURY, HENRY J. <i>The Book of Acts in History.</i> (Roy Bowen Ward)	94
CULLMANN, OSCAR. <i>The Early Church: Studies in Early Christian History and Theology.</i> (Dr. William Green)	138
CULLMANN, OSCAR. <i>Baptism in the New Testament.</i> (Abraham J. Malherbe)	235
GASTER, THEODORE. <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls in English Translation.</i> (Frank Pack)	142
JEREMIAS, JOACHIM. <i>Did the Primitive Church Practice Infant Baptism?</i> (Dieter Allen)	237
RAMM, BERNARD. <i>The Pattern of Authority.</i> (J. D. Thomas)	142
RIDDERBOS, HERMAN N. <i>The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia.</i> (J. W. Roberts)	47
SIMPSON, E. K. <i>The Pastoral Epistles.</i> (J. W. Roberts)	141
STEVENSON, HERBERT F. <i>Titles of the Triune God.</i> E. Ferguson)	47
The Christian view of history. WILLIAM M. GREEN	99
CHURCH. EARLY. The ministry of the Word in the first two centuries. EVERETT FERGUSON	21
<i>Commentary on the Book of Acts.</i> BRUCE. Review by Frank Pack	143
CONFESSION. Baptismal confession. WILLIAM B. DECKER	180
<i>The Dead Sea Scrolls in English Translation.</i> GASTER. Review by Frank Pack	142
DECKER, WILLIAM B. Baptismal confession	180
DECKER, WILLIAM B. Personalalia	237
<i>Did the Primitive Church Practice Infant Baptism?</i> JOACHIM JEREMIAS. Review by Dieter Alten	237
<i>The Early Church.</i> CULLMANN. Review by Dr. Wm. Green	138
<i>The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia.</i> RIDDERBOS. Review by J. W. Roberts	47
Exegetical helps . . . the genitive with nouns of action. J. W. ROBERTS	35
Exegetical helps . . . questions expecting affirmative and negative answers. J. W. ROBERTS	117
FAITH. Baptism and faith. J. D. THOMAS	166
FANNING, TOLBERT. A. R. HOLTON	32
FERGUSON, EVERETT.	
Baptism from the second to the fourth century	185
The ministry of the Word in the first two centuries	21
Review of BARRETT: <i>The New Testament Background</i>	91
Review of STEVENSON: <i>Titles of the Triune God</i>	47
FERGUSON, W. EVERETT. Personalalia	46
FILBECK, ORVAL. Method in teaching	121
FILBECK, ORVAL. Personalalia	129
Gospels. See BIBLE. N. T. GOSPELS	
GRAHAM, RALPH V. Psychotherapy and the Christian mission	12, 70
GRAHAM, RALPH. Personalalia	46
GREEK LANGUAGE. HELLENISTIC N. T. WORD STUDIES.	
Exegetical helps . . . the genitive with nouns of action. J. W. ROBERTS	32
Exegetical helps . . . questions expecting affirmative and negative answers. J. W. ROBERTS	117

GREEN, WILLIAM	
Ancient comment on instrumental music in the Psalms	3
The Christian view of history	99
Review of CULLMANN: <i>The Early Church</i>	138
GREEN, WILLIAM. Personalia	46
HARRELL, PAT E.	
Jewish proselyte baptism	159
The smallness and greatness of Herod	79
HARRELL, PAT E. Personalia	69, 237
HEROD. The smallness and greatness of Herod. PAT E. HARRELL	79
HISTORY. PHILOSOPHY. The Christian view of history.	
WILLIAM M. GREEN	99
HOLTON, A. R. Tolbert Fanning	32
HOLTON, A. R. Personalia	46
INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN CHURCHES. Ancient comment on instrumental music in the Psalms. WILLIAM GREEN	3
Jewish proselyte baptism. PAT E. HARRELL	159
List of recent Master's Theses in Bible and Bible related studies at Abilene Christian College	130
McCORD, HUGO. The synoptic problem	51
McCORD, HUGO. Personalia	69
MALHERBE, ABRAHAM J.	
Notes on religious washings in the Graeco-Roman world ..	152
Review of BARTH: <i>The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism</i>	235
Review of CULLMANN: <i>Baptism in the New Testament</i> ..	235
MALHERBE, ABRAHAM J. Personalia	237
Meaning from context. JAMES M. TOLLE	76
Methods in teaching. ORVAL FILBECK	121
MILLIKEN, CALLIE FAYE. Personalia	237
The ministry of the Word in the first two centuries. EVERETT FERGUSON	21
<i>The New Testament Background: Selected Documents.</i> BARRETT, ed. Review by Everett Ferguson	91
Notes on religious washings in the Graeco-Roman world. ABE MALHERBE	152
The Old Testament and archeology. JOHN A. SCOTT	41, 124
PACK, FRANK	
Review of BRUCE: <i>The Acts of the Apostles</i>	144
Review of BRUCE: <i>Commentary on the Book of Acts</i>	143
Review of GASTER: <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls in English Translation</i>	142
Some modern views of infant baptism	220
PACK, FRANK. Personalia	129, 237
<i>The Pastoral Epistles.</i> SIMPSON. Review by J. W. Roberts ..	141
<i>The Pattern of Authority.</i> RAMM. Review by J. D. Thomas ..	142
PHILOSOPHY. The relation of philosophy and religion. J. D. THOMAS	113
PREACHING. The ministry of the Word in the first two centuries. EVERETT FERGUSON	21
Principles of Biblical interpretation in the Restoration movement. PAUL SOUTHERN	9
PSYCHOTHERAPY. Psychotherapy and the Christian mission. RALPH V. GRAHAM	12, 70

Psychotherapy and the Christian mission. RALPH V. GRAHAM	12, 70
The relation of philosophy and religion. J. D. THOMAS	113
RELIGION. The relation of philosophy and religion. J. D. THOMAS	113
RESTORATION MOVEMENT. Principles of Biblical interpretation in the Restoration movement. PAUL SOUTHERN	9
ROBERTS, J. W.	
Baptism for remission of sins—a critique	226
The bearing of the use of particles on the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles	132
Exegetical helps . . . The genitive with nouns of action	35
Exegetical helps . . . questions expecting affirmative and negative answers	117
Review of RIDDERBOS: <i>The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia</i>	47
Review of SIMPSON: <i>The Pastoral Epistles</i>	141
ROBERTS, J. W. Personalia	46, 237
ROBERTS, R. L., JR. This name Baptist	177
ROBERTS, R. L., JR. Personalia	237
SALVONI, FAUSTO. Baptism in the medieval Church	198
SALVONI, FAUSTO. Personalia	237
SCOTT, JOHN A.	
The Old Testament and archeology	41, 124
The use of <i>Bapto</i> in the Old Testament	147
SCOTT, JOHN A. Personalia	46, 237
The smallness and greatness of Herod. PAT A. HARRELL	79
Some modern views of infant baptism. FRANK PACK	220
SOUTHERN, PAUL. Principles of Biblical interpretation in the Restoration movement	9
SOUTHERN, PAUL. Personalia	46
SPAIN, CARL. Baptism in the Restoration movement	213
SPAIN, CARL. Personalia	237
The spiritual significance of baptism. JAMES D. WILLEFORD	172
The synoptic problem. HUGO MCCORD	51
TEACHING. Method in teaching. ORVAL FILBECK	121
<i>The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism.</i> BARTH.	
Review by Abe Malherbe	235
This name Baptist. R. L. ROBERTS, JR.	177
THOMAS, J. D.	
Baptism and faith	166
The relation of philosophy and religion	113
Review of RAMM: <i>The Pattern of Authority</i>	142
Time and history	17
THOMAS, J. D. Personalia	46, 237
TIME. Time and history. J. D. Thomas	17
Time and history. J. D. THOMAS	17
<i>Titles of the Triune God.</i> STEVENSON. Review by E. Ferguson	47
Tolbert Fanning. A. R. HOLTON	32
TOLLE, JAMES M. Meaning from context	76
TOLLE, JAMES. Personalia	69
TRANSMIGRATION. Time and history. J. D. THOMAS	17
The use of <i>Bapto</i> in the Old Testament. JOHN SCOTT	147
Ward, Roy B. Review of CADBURY: <i>The Book of Acts in History</i>	94
WILLEFORD, JAMES D. The spiritual significance of baptism	172
WILLEFORD, JAMES D. Personalia	237

— RENEWAL TIME —

It is time to renew your subscription to the Restoration Quarterly. By acting at once you will be assured of receiving every issue of Volume II.

In addition to a variety of scholarly articles and book reviews, the special issue, of double size, will be on the theme of THE CHURCH. Its general prospectus includes:

THE CHURCH IN ITS EARLY ENVIRONMENT

Graeco-Roman World: The widespread need of a sense of belonging in Hellenistic society as expressed in burial clubs, mystery religions, etc. . . . How the church fulfilled their needs

Jewish World: The concept of the people of God among the Jews . . . The significance of their belief in corporate personality . . . The concept of the True Israel . . . The constitution of the Qumran community . . . Discussion of *qahal*, *edah*, and *kenishta*.

THE CHURCH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Meaning of "Church": Linguistic studies of *ekklesia* and *koinonia*.

Jesus and the Church: His intention to build the church . . . The church and the Kingdom of God . . . The relationship of Peter to the church.

Paul and the Church: His elaborations of the church through the concepts of "the Body," "the Bride" etc. . . The unity of the church.

The Primitive Community: The structure of the early church . . . its members . . . The idea of discipline . . . The significance of its names.

THE CHURCH IN HISTORY

In Catholicism: The view of the church as it developed in Catholicism, especially as reflected in Augustine.

In the Reformation: The concept of the church as it found expression in the great Reformers and in the Anabaptists.

In the Restoration: The concept of the church in the Restoration movement, especially as reflected in Alexander Campbell.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Regular -----\$3.00

Student -----\$2.00

Group of Five -----\$2.00
(each)

Name -----

Street -----

City ----- State -----

☐ Renewal

☐ Bill Me

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE

Abilene, Texas

The Graduate School of Abilene Christian College offers courses leading to the Master of Arts, Master of Science, and Master of Education Degrees. Master's degree programs are available in five departmental areas: Bible and Religious Education, Business Administration, Education, Mathematics, and Natural Science. Major fields outside the Bible Department include: Accounting, Biology, Chemistry, Economics, Elementary Education, General Business, Mathematics, Physics, School Administration (elementary and secondary), and Secondary Education.

Graduate Study in Bible and Religious Education

In the Department of Bible and Religious Education, students with the necessary prerequisites may work toward the Master of Arts degree with majors in either the Biblical Field (including Biblical Languages), the Doctrinal Field, or the Historical Field; or they may become candidates for the Master of Science degree with a major in the Practical Field. Each of these degrees calls for a minimum of 30 semester hours of graduate study, including six hours for a thesis. The young men who have received degrees in these areas during recent years are finding places of larger usefulness in the church and in Christian education, as preachers or educational directors in the churches, and as teachers in Christian colleges and in Bible Chair programs.

Graduate Faculty in Bible and Religious Education

Paul Southern, Th.D., Head	Lowell Perry, Ph.D.
Fred J. Barton, Ph.D.	J. W. Roberts, Ph.D.
Eugene Clevenger, B.D.	W. R. Smith, M. A.
Robert L. Johnson, Ph.D.	Carl Spain, B.D., M.A.
J. P. Lewis, B.D., M.A.	J. D. Thomas, Ph.D.
Frank Pack, Ph.D.	Woodrow Wilson, Th.D.

Accreditation

As a member of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary School, all the work at Abilene Christian College has the highest accreditation.

For additional information write to:

Fred J. Barton
Dean of the Graduate School
Abilene Christian College
Abilene, Texas

